

No 9335. Va 197

1-6



GIVEN BY

THE BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE
STATE OF MICHIGAN—Part 4
(DETROIT—Labor)

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

MAY 5, 1954

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

INCLUDING INDEX



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

SEP 28 1954

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

CLYDE DOYLE, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

COURTNEY E. OWENS, *Acting Chief Investigator*

CONTENTS

	Page
May 5, 1954, testimony of—	
James E. Cichocki-----	5222
Bolza Baxter, Jr-----	5227
Bernard Bellinson-----	5249
William H. Johnson-----	5255
George Leroy Ellery-----	5282
Paul Ross Baker-----	5286
Evelyn Gladstone-----	5290
Index-----	i

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * * 17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members. * * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * * (q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together, with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83D CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN—PART 4

(Detroit—Labor)

WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1954

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Detroit, Mich.

PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 9:35 a. m. in room 859, Federal Building, Hon. Kit Clardy (acting chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Kit Clardy (acting chairman), Gordon H. Scherer, and Morgan M. Moulder.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Donald T. Appell and W. Jackson Jones, investigators; and Mrs. Juliette P. Joray, acting clerk.

Mr. CLARDY. The committee will be in order.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, in order to work out our schedule I made a promise to counsel for one of the witnesses to call his case first this morning.

Mr. CLARDY. Who is that?

Mr. TAVENNER. It is Mr. James Cichocki.

Mr. CLARDY. Very well. Before you proceed, though, I had intended to call Mr. Baxter. I see he is here this morning. I want to let him know that during the interval since last he was to the stand that the subcommittee has carefully gone over and considered the motion that was filed and has denied it and has concluded that matter. But instead of going forward with you first as I had intended, I bow to the suggestion of Mr. Tavenner. Will you call your witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Cichocki, will you come forward, please?

Mr. NELSON. May I respond for Mr. Cichocki?

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon, sir. Will you identify yourself for the record?

Mr. NELSON. Walter M. Nelson, attorney for James Cichocki.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Nelson, may I suggest we will go off the record here because under the rules we do not permit counsel to address us on the record, so we will take a brief recess, and you may step up here to the bench, if you wish, and talk it over.

(Whereupon, at 9:37 a. m., the hearing was recessed.)

(Whereupon, at 9:45 a. m., the hearing was reconvened.)

Mr. CLARDY. Back on the record.

Mr. Tavenner, I want to make a statement for the record.

I have explained to Mr. Nelson, who is attorney for Mr. Cichocki, the rule which prohibits counsel from arguing or doing anything other than sitting beside the witness and advising him on his constitutional rights. But I have also told him, as I have others and as the committee has told others and as the rule specifically provides, that he may file a written statement of his objections to having his client photographed, which is the nubbin of the objection which he makes and that since he was apparently not advised as to precisely how to do it until we had this conversation, we will receive it as part of the record and as timely filed.

We will accord him that privilege and will go forward with the matter by calling Mr. Cichocki and have it understood on the record that he has made timely objection to any photographs whatsoever. I want to caution the newspaper photographers that as soon as Mr. Cichocki is sworn and as the rule provides, no further pictures will be permitted of this particular witness.

Mr. Cichocki, please.

Hold up your right hand. You do solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CICHOCKI. I do.

Mr. CLARDY. You are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. NELSON. Walter M. Nelson, 1438 Dime Building, Detroit.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Nelson, while you are not permitted to address the Chair, as I said, I have known you and of you for a great many years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

TESTIMONY OF JAMES E. CICHOCKI, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, WALTER M. NELSON

Mr. CICHOCKI. James E. Cichocki.

Mr. CLARDY. Pronounce it again for me.

Mr. CICHOCKI. Well, it is pronounced different ways, but Cichocki.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Cichocki?

Mr. CICHOCKI. Detroit, Mich., October 7, 1917.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you resided in Detroit all your life?

Mr. CICHOCKI. Thirty-six and a half years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation or profession?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I am president of Local 742, UAW-CIO.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you held that position?

Mr. CICHOCKI. Seven years, nominated for 2 years this coming—last October—I mean last Thursday.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you required under the Federal statutes to sign an affidavit known as the Taft-Hartley affidavit?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I plead my immunity under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, you will recall that there has been referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities for consideration a bill dealing with a substitute relating to the present Taft-Hartley affidavit.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, I am familiar with it. I have been helping mark it up, as you know.

Mr. TAVENNER. And I had intended to question this witness with regard to the operation of the present act so far as he is aware of it.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have a request to make of the Chair?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir, I think the witness should be directed to answer the question.

Mr. CLARDY. I am in accord, and I direct that you answer the question, witness.

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on—

Mr. CLARDY. Perhaps I should add a little note of explanation. Our interest in this information, as Mr. Tavenner has indicated, is solely for the purpose of obtaining facts and information to enable us to do a better job in drafting a piece of legislation which the committee is sponsoring, intended to supplant and take the place of the present Taft-Hartley oath provision, which I don't mind telling you I regard as in many ways unworkable and unwieldy and having other objections.

Can we have something in the way of a proposed legislative substitute that is pretty well along the way, and what we are seeking and all we are seeking in this line of questions is to find out from you some facts that will either strengthen or maybe destroy the arguments and the conclusions that we have reached in attempting to put forward this new legislation.

Now, will you proceed, Mr. Tavenner, and I have directed you to answer that question for the reason I have just indicated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not sure that the witness has answered under the direction.

Mr. CLARDY. No; he did not.

Mr. CICHOCKI. I plead the immunity of the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. You decline to answer on that ground?

Mr. CICHOCKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Being the president of your local it is my recollection of the language of the statute that you are required to execute the Taft-Hartley affidavit. Have you received any instructions or any suggestions from the Communist Party as to how the Taft-Hartley affidavit is to be considered by members of the Communist Party who are required to sign it? Assuming that they occupy positions covered by the act.

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I plead the immunity of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been present on any occasion—

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon, Mr. Tavenner. I direct the witness to answer that last question.

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I plead the immunity of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been present on any occasion when the subject of execution of the Taft-Hartley affidavit, non-Communist

affidavit, has been discussed by members of the Communist Party; that is, persons known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I plead the immunity of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time during the 7-year period during which you have been president of Briggs Manufacturing Co. local UAW-CIO?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I plead the immunity of the fifth amendment.

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Bereniece Baldwin?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I plead the immunity of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where is your residence in Detroit?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. 5536 Field Avenue.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what area of Detroit is that?

Mr. CICHOCKI. East side of Detroit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever lived in the Hamtramck section?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I never lived in the Hamtramck section.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever at any time been a member of the Young Communist League?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I plead the immunity of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. In 1943 isn't it a fact, witness, that you were the president of the Foster-Mooney Branch of the Young Communist League?

Mr. CICHOCKI. I plead the immunity of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. In 1944 did you live in Hamtramck?

Mr. CICHOCKI. No, sir.

Mr. NELSON. Pardon me. Did he say "live" or "work"?

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever live in Hamtramck?

Mr. CICHOCKI. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever work in Hamtramck?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question whether he ever worked in Hamtramck.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; I so direct, witness.

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Why in the early part of 1944 did you transfer your membership in the Young Communist League from the Foster-Mooney Branch to the Hamtramck section of the Communist Party?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, now, isn't it a fact that the last year that the Communist Party issued membership cards was in the year 1948? Don't you know that as a matter of fact?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't it a fact that your Communist Party membership card issued in the year 1947 for the year 1948 was No. 71476?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Your Communist Party membership has continued up until the present moment, hasn't it?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon me. I think perhaps, due to the fact that some of you were not here on the opening day, that I had best repeat an injunction that I gave at that time. I want to make it very clear that those in the audience are guests of the Congress of the United States and that we cannot and will not permit any demonstration of any kind. We would hate very much to be compelled to clear the courtroom. The business of this committee will not permit interruptions of any kind.

We have a very heavy schedule. It is going to be difficult, if not impossible, to finish all the work we have mapped out for us at this time, and so I suggest to you that you remain absolutely quiet throughout the proceeding.

Mr. Tavenner, you may proceed.

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Witness, I hand you a photostatic copy of an excerpt from the September 3, 1948, issue of the Detroit News. It is entitled "A Labor Day Message to President Truman." The first paragraph of this letter or message is as follows:

We, the undersigned trade unionists, protest the indictment of the 12 national leaders of the Communist Party under the undemocratic and antilabor Smith Act.

Will you examine the document, please, and state whether or not you see your name to that message?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you see your name signed to that message?

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence for identification and ask that it be marked Cichocki Exhibit No. 1.

Mr. CLARDY. It may be received.

(The photostatic copy of excerpt from September 3, 1948, issue of Detroit News entitled "A Labor Day Message to President Truman," marked "Cichocki Exhibit No. 1" for identification, was received in evidence.)¹

Mr. TAVENNER. I now hand you a photostatic copy of a page from the September 28, 1943, issue of the Daily Worker, and the heading is:

1,400 Unionists Hit Indictment of Communists, a partial list of the 1,100 trade-union leaders who have protested the indictment of the 12 Communist Party leaders.

Will you examine the document and see whether or not your name appears as one of that list. I should have asked you whether or not your name appears in that list as president of your local.

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

¹ Retained in committee files.

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't it a fact that it was the plan of the Communist Party to have responsible people in labor organizations oppose all proceedings against defendants under the Smith Act?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Tavenner, was it your intention to offer the document in evidence?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I desire to offer the document described as the September 23, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker in evidence and suggest that it be marked Cichocki Exhibit No. 2 for identification.

Mr. CLARDY. It will be received.

(The photostatic copy of page from September 28, 1943, issue of Daily Worker, entitled "1,400 Unionists Hit Indictment of Communists," marked Cichocki Exhibit No. 2 for identification, was received in evidence.)¹

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a point of information?

Mr. CLARDY. We will go off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. CLARDY. On the record.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you seen instructions at any time issued by the Communist Party to groups of the Communist Party on that subject—that is, the subject of action to be taken with regard to Smith Act prosecutions?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CLARDY. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, isn't it a fact that you have been identified with and active in at least 20 different Communist Party activities and front organizations during the past 10 years?

Mr. CICHOCKI. I rely on the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Any questions, Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. I have no questions but this: What is your occupation now?

(At this point Mr. Cichocki conferred with Mr. Nelson.)

Mr. CICHOCKI. I am president of Local 742, UAW-CIO.

Mr. CLARDY. Commonly known as the Briggs local?

Mr. CICHOCKI. The Chrysler automotive body division.

Mr. CLARDY. Any further questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness is excused.

Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bolza Baxter, please.

Mr. CLARDY. Hold up your right hand.

¹ Retained in committee files.

Mr. BAXTER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Hold up your right hand. After you are sworn I will permit you to address the Chair.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BAXTER. I do.

Mr. CLARDY. All right. Will you identify your counsel? Will you identify yourself, counsel?

Mr. HENRY. My name is Milton R. Henry. I represent the defendant, Bolza Baxter.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you both be seated now. I understand your witness has a remark he would like to address to the Chair, and he may do so.

**TESTIMONY OF BOLZA BAXTER, JR., ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS
COUNSEL, MILTON R. HENRY**

Mr. BAXTER. First, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for point of clarification.

Mr. CLARDY. Very well.

Mr. BAXTER. The denial of my special appearance motion, I want—

Mr. CLARDY. I don't follow you there. You say you want an explanation of the denial?

Mr. BAXTER. Yes. I want to know if the denial means that you refuse to receive it or that it wouldn't be—

Mr. CLARDY. No, I mean to say this, and I understand why you might be confused, because I did make a brief statement. As you know, I told you yesterday I intended to call you as the first witness. I was unaware of the promise Mr. Tavenner made to the counsel for the witness who just preceded you. The subcommittee has considered the motion that you made, which, of course, in essence goes to the jurisdiction and the right of this committee in connection with your appearance here. We are receiving it for the files and are denying the relief which you seek in the petition, so we will proceed.

Mr. BAXTER. Does that also mean, Mr. Chairman, that it will not be received for the record?

Mr. CLARDY. Everything is received for the files and records of the committee, and it will be part of your file, you may be assured.

Mr. BAXTER. Thank you.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, Mr. Tavenner, will you proceed with your questions?

Mr. BAXTER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make one observation—

Mr. CLARDY. Is this in the form of a question?

Mr. BAXTER. Well, no, it is not in the form of a question.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you pause just a moment, and I will explain something to you. If you will answer our questions as they are propounded, freely and fairly, we will permit you at the conclusion of your testimony to make any relevant statement you may care to make. This rule is not made just applicable to you. It is a standing rule that is in print and has been for some time, a standing rule that if the witness refuses to answer and, in common parlance, "takes the fifth

amendment," we do not permit the introduction of a statement, written or oral. With that understanding, if you have any other question, we will get it out of the way before Mr. Tavenner starts.

Mr. BAXTER. I understand the procedure as far as the response to questions. But since this matter that I wanted to address you on had to do with some developments prior to my being sworn in, I think it is appropriate that I be permitted to comment on that aspect because it happened before this committee.

Mr. CLARDY. No, I am sure you would not under any circumstances want this committee to single you out for either a special favor or something unusual in the opposite direction and we have no intention—

Mr. BAXTER. That is precisely what has happened, and that is what I want to comment on.

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon me just a moment.

Mr. BAXTER. I want to indicate that I have been sworn under objections.

Mr. CLARDY. Oh, well, I am sure of that.

Mr. BAXTER. And I want to also state that I strenuously object to the indignities that you have subjected my attorney to, and—

Mr. CLARDY. May we go off the record just a moment.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. CLARDY. On the record. Will you proceed, Mr. Tavenner, with your questioning.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. BAXTER. Bolza Baxter, Jr.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Baxter, do you appear here pursuant to a subpoena served upon you by Mr. Donald T. Appell, investigator of the House of Representatives, on the 2d day of December 1953?

Mr. BAXTER. I am here in response to a subpoena served me under the signature of the Honorable Harold H. Velde.

Mr. TAVENNER. I offer the subpoena in evidence, Mr. Chairman, and ask that it be marked "Baxter Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. CLARDY. It will be received.

(The subpoena of December 2, 1953, marked "Baxter Exhibit No. 1" was received in evidence.)¹

Mr. TAVENNER. Will the witness please examine the exhibit and state whether or not that is the subpoena under which he appears?

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. This appears to be a copy of the subpoena served me. I see it carries the signature of Harold Velde. I want to make it clear that I object to the form. The subpoena is not addressed to me. It is addressed to one Donald Appell to summon me. I have never received a summons, and I want to indicate clearly that I don't waive any objections I have to the form of the subpoena and its scope.

Mr. TAVENNER. A copy or the original was left with you at the time service was made by Mr. Appell, was it not?

Mr. BAXTER. I received the subpoena signed by Harold H. Velde. I am here in response to that subpoena.

Mr. MOULDER. You received a copy of the document that has been shown to you there?

¹ Retained in committee files.

Mr. BAXTER. I received a subpēna under the signature of Harold H. Velde, and I am here in response to that subpēna. I think that question is responsive, and I don't think it needs any elaboration.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, Mr. Baxter, I am sure that you see what we are trying to get at.

Mr. BAXTER. I don't know what you are trying to get at.

Mr. CLARDY. I am sure you recognize this as an accurate copy of the actual document in the possession of the one who served the subpēna, do you not? In other words, I don't want to quibble with you or you with me because I am sure you understand that this is merely a preliminary foundation question and nothing more.

Mr. BAXTER. Well, I don't want to quibble with you, Congressman.

Mr. CLARDY. Thank you.

Mr. BAXTER. The only point I am making here is that I am here in response to the subpēna served me, and I think to that extent the answer is responsive and establishes the necessary facts to proceed.

Mr. CLARDY. It isn't responsive, but we will pass on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you chairman of the Labor Youth League of Michigan on the 2d day of December 1953?

Mr. BAXTER. I think I should make it clear at the outset that anything you ask me within the scope of the authority given you by the enabling resolution must necessarily be of such a nature as to come within the purview of either the Internal Security Act of 1950 or similar acts. Such acts are penal statutes, and the fifth amendment forbids inquiry into past conduct which may be construed by this committee or any other committee as penal in nature except after presentment or indictment of a grand jury. I invoke the due process section of the fifth amendment as well as other sections of the fifth amendment and will refuse to answer any questions that this committee may care to ask me. I further decline to answer any questions before this committee and invoke my privilege under the due process clause of the fifth amendment against testifying before a committee whose power is derived from a resolution barred under the first amendment as well as my privilege under the first amendment to be free in the exercise of my rights to inquire, think, and speak from either prior or subsequent congressional harrassment through hearings, investigations, reports, subpēnas, or through other devices.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes. I so direct.

Mr. BAXTER. I sought to make it clear at the outset.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct this witness to answer the question.

Mr. BAXTER. I understood you.

Mr. SCHERER. Will you keep quiet just a minute?

Mr. BAXTER. No, you keep quiet. The question had already been put to me.

Mr. CLARDY. I think it would be well if we remember that the reporter can do a much better job if only one of us talks at a time, and we shall be more than patient with you, Mr. Baxter, but please refrain from interrupting any member of the committee or counsel. We will—

Mr. BAXTER. He interrupted me, didn't he?

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon me. You are doing the very thing I am cautioning you against. At the moment that arrives for you to reply, we shall not cut you off unless you try to make a speech, in which event I shall be compelled to interrupt you and suggest that you direct yourself to the question. Now, hold still just a moment. Will you repeat your question, Mr. Scherer, because I didn't get either side of that last exchange.

Mr. SCHERER. I am asking that you direct this witness to answer the question asked by Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. CLARDY. I did direct him and he—

Mr. SCHERER. He started to make a speech.

Mr. BAXTER. I started to give my answer.

Mr. CLARDY. As I understand it, despite all the other things you may have said, you did decline to answer on the fifth amendment.

Mr. BAXTER. I did not yet. I was about to give my answer and would like to give it if the Congressman would permit me.

Mr. CLARDY. I will shorten it. Do you—

Mr. BAXTER. Congressman Clardy, this is supposed to be a hearing, my hearing as well as yours.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you invoke the fifth amendment?

Mr. BAXTER. I am entitled to respond to the—

Mr. CLARDY. Do you invoke the fifth amendment?

Mr. BAXTER. I am as concerned with the taxpayers' money as you are, but I don't want the newspapers to say tomorrow that Baxter used the fifth amendment 57 times. I may use it 57 times, but I am going to use some other things also.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, may I give you a suggestion or two? If you desire to refuse to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment or any of the other amendments, even though we do not recognize them, you are entitled to state that fact. State that first and then if there is some explanation which the Chair deems relevant and pertinent, we shall not cut you off at all. Only in the event that you attempt to make a stump speech, so to speak—

Mr. BAXTER. What kind of speech?

Mr. CLARDY. As we have heard many times, will I interrupt you at all. Let us get back to the question. Do you decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment?

Mr. BAXTER. I decline to answer the question on the ground previously stated which is the fifth amendment, and also the first amendment which prevents Congress from making laws in the area of speech, assembly, press, et cetera, and I think the committee in the very posing of the question is violating that amendment, and I assert that amendment in refusing to allow you to violate my rights under the first amendment as well as the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, Mr. Baxter, so that we may, in your answering other questions, suggest, now that you have stated it rather fully, that in the next series, if you want to raise these objections that you have now voiced, you may do so and have full protection by saying that you decline to answer on the grounds already advanced, and that will be considered by the committee as a complete restatement each time of all of the grounds upon which you rely.

Mr. BAXTER. Is that an order, or is that a suggestion that you want me to consider?

Mr. CLARDY. I am at no time, as chairman, attempting to tell you precisely what you may say. Your answer as you see fit, but of course at your own risk. Now will you proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Baxter, the subpena served upon you by Mr. Donald T. Appell, investigator of this committee, constituting Baxter Exhibit No. 1, requires you to produce all the books and records of the Labor Youth League of Michigan containing the names of all State and section officers of the Labor Youth League of Michigan, the names of all members of said league, all financial records of said league and the minutes of meetings held by the Labor Youth League of Michigan during the years of 1952 and 1953. Will you produce them now?

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. Would you restate the question, please?

Mr. CLARDY. Read it, Miss Reporter.

(The question was read by the reporter as follows:)

Mr. Baxter, the subpena served upon you by Mr. Donald T. Appell, investigator of this committee, constituting Baxter Exhibit No. 1, requires you to produce all the books and records of the Labor Youth League of Michigan containing the names of all State and section officers of the Labor Youth League of Michigan, the names of all members of said league, all financial records of said league and the minutes of meetings held by the Labor Youth League of Michigan during the years of 1952 and 1953. Will you produce them now?

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. I will refuse to answer that question, relying on my rights under the first amendment and my rights under the fourth amendment my reasons being, I believe with all my heart that the American Constitution, specifically the first and fourth amendments which I am relying on, protect me against the compulsion of a subpnea issued in the form that it was—

Mr. CLARDY. May I interrupt to ask you a question so I will understand what you are getting at?

Mr. BAXTER. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. You said you refuse to answer the question. By that did you mean you were making a flat refusal to produce the documents demanded by the subpnea served upon you?

Mr. BAXTER. I mean that I am refusing to answer the question put to me.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you were asked to produce them, and I am merely trying to clarify it to be sure that you mean that you will not produce them. Is that the intent of what you are saying?

Mr. BAXTER. I mean I will refuse to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. There is no question asked the witness. It was a direction to produce.

Mr. CLARDY. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. There is no question before the witness.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Tavenner, will you withdraw your question for a moment?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. The question is withdrawn.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Baxter, I will address a new admonition to you or suggestion. You have been commanded by the proper subpnea duces tecum issued by this committee to produce the documents which Mr. Tavenner has described to you and which were properly described in

the subpena. Will you now produce those for the committee at this time?

Mr. BAXTER. I will refuse to answer that question on the grounds of the first amendment and the fourth amendment because I believe that the American Constitution, specifically those amendments combined, protect me against the compulsion of a subpena issued under the form you indicated to accomplish the ends therein described and because I believe that the fourth amendment invalidates a subpena which performs the efforts of a writ of assistance or general warrant, no matter what agency of Government issues the same, and because I believe that a subpena so framed as the one issued me is in fact no subpena to me at all in the contemplation of the law, and because I have heretofore in the courts been denied the right to object to the process and the irregularities attending its form and issuance, I will, without admitting or denying membership in the Labor Youth League or being in possession of any books and records, deny that under my privilege raised under the fourth amendment any duty imposes upon me to respond in any fashion to the command of the subpena and to the question that has been posed. I consider that to be my answer to the question raised.

Mr. CLARDY. I will come back to my question because I do not consider it as a direct answer to the request that I made and say you refuse to answer the question.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. CLARDY. Actually what I want to get at and to make sure on this record is that you will not at any time during the progress of this hearing produce for the use of the committee the documents sought by the subpena duces tecum. Am I correct in my understanding that you will not produce them?

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry)

Mr. BAXTER. I would like to pose a question at this point.

Mr. CLARDY. You answer my—

Mr. BAXTER. Then I will come back to your question.

Mr. CLARDY. You answer me, sir, and then if you have a reasonable and proper question, I will be very glad—

Mr. BAXTER. I can't answer your question until I find out the answer to the question I am about to pose.

Mr. CLARDY. All right. May I point out to you—

Mr. BAXTER. In other words—

Mr. CLARDY. Hold still. I couldn't hear what you were saying because you cut in right in the middle of what I was saying. I think today you are doing your best to be a gentleman, sir.

Mr. BAXTER. I always do, Congressman.

Mr. CLARDY. And I hope that you will continue. Now, bear with me. Answer my question, and then if you have any relevant inquiry to make of the Chair, we will be most happy to give you any information you want.

Mr. BAXTER. Well, all I am saying is that I have what I consider to be a relevant point here which would assist me, perhaps, in responding to your question.

Mr. CLARDY. All right.

Mr. BAXTER. I think in all fairness I should—

Mr. CLARDY. State it if it will be brief.

Mr. BAXTER. The question is simply this: For what purposes, what legislative purposes could the request for names of all members of the Labor Youth League have for this committee?

Mr. CLARDY. It will serve a most useful purpose for this committee to have information concerning the LYL, Labor Youth League, and all of its activities and the identity of its members. Beyond that the committee is not prepared to say anything further. It is our considered judgment, having asked for the documents, that they will greatly help the committee in the expediting and in the handling of the problems confronting it. Now will you come back to what I started out with a moment ago. I wanted this record to leave no doubt as to whether you intend to and will produce the records that have been subpenaed. Obviously, if by the end of the hearing you have not produced them, the conclusion will be inescapable that you will not do so, but I am giving you an opportunity to say whether you will or will not at this juncture.

Mr. BAXTER. I have——

Mr. CLARDY. Go ahead.

Mr. BAXTER. I have not admitted being either a member of, an officer of, or being in possession of any records of a Labor Youth League, and a yes or no answer to the question posed would tend to imply or would lead to the inescapable conclusion that I am in possession of such records, which I will not do, and I will assert the answer previously given for the previously stated reasons in refusing to respond to the question, and I will invoke the fifth amendment also in refusing to respond to that question.

Mr. CLARDY. Very well. The Chair now directs that you produce the documents called for in the subpena.

Mr. BAXTER. I think I made it clear that anything that this committee may ask me, any demand that it may make of me comes under certain penal statutes, and it is my belief, and I assert that belief in refusing to respond to the question or the demand, that the fifth amendment forbids inquiry into past conduct which may be construed as penal in nature and to request me to produce anything except after presentment or indictment of a grand jury. I think that is the function of a grand jury, and I don't think this committee has any right to make any such demands, and I will assert the fifth amendment in refusing to respond to the question posed.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. And the fourth and the first which I previously used.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Baxter?

Mr. BAXTER. I was born in Franklin County, Fla., July 26, 1924.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. BAXTER. I reside at 5057 Holcomb, Detroit.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Detroit?

Mr. BAXTER. Oh, approximately 3 years, pretty close to 3 years, maybe a few months off.

Mr. TAVENNER. That takes you back to about 1951?

Mr. BAXTER. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live prior to 1951?

Mr. BAXTER. May I ask what relevance has that question?

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct him to answer.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, answer the question, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. BAXTER. I beg your pardon?

Mr. CLARDY. I say, you are directed to answer the question.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this is not a laughing matter. I think the record should show that counsel and the witness, when they confer, have been laughing and smiling and—

Mr. BAXTER. I don't know how the record can show that, Congressman, based on what you observed. I think this is being a very serious matter, and I don't think it is your right to determine whether or not we smile or frown.

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon?

Mr. BAXTER. You have smiled.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Baxter, I told you earlier, we possess information—

Mr. BAXTER. I have a right to consult with counsel, Congressman.

Mr. CLARDY. May I have the floor for a moment? As I explained to you, we have infinite patience—we have to have on this job—but if you choose to treat it lightly, as Congressman Scherer seems to think you do—

Mr. BAXTER. That is entirely his opinion, Congressman Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Hold still just a minute, please. I am not trying to be arbitrary, and I don't think—

Mr. BAXTER. You are trying to put me in jail, and this man is saying I don't take it seriously.

Mr. SCHERER. I think it is a typical display of the Communist tactics.

Mr. BAXTER. I don't care what you think it is. You are trying to put me in jail, and I insist on my right to defend myself, and it is no laughing matter.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. SCHERER. That is what I was calling to your attention, son.

Mr. BAXTER. Son—I am 28 years old, Congressman, so don't address me as "son."

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Baxter, please subside. We are not trying to do anything other than conduct this hearing in an orderly way, but I want to again admonish the audience. One more outburst of that kind, and you will leave me no recourse but to conduct this hearing without an audience. I hope I do not have to repeat again.

Now, Mr. Baxter, you have a perfect right to conduct yourself there in any way you see fit, but so, also, does Mr. Scherer have a right to call to the attention of the record the fact that you were doing what he said you were. We do not have any intention of preventing you from doing it, but neither do we have any intention of allowing the record to not disclose what actually takes place and which cannot be recorded in the written word. Now, will you proceed, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. BAXTER. Congressman Clardy, am I permitted to deny—

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have a question?

Mr. BAXTER. Yes. Am I permitted to deny what impressions Congressman Scherer may have gathered for the record?

Mr. CLARDY. I think not at this time, sir.

Mr. BAXTER. I mean, he is permitted to accuse me of something, but I am not permitted to deny—

Mr. CLARDY. I saw you and counsel having a pretty good time together there myself. I refrained from saying anything about it. Even your attorney is amused now, and he is entitled to be. Perhaps this is funny, but let us get on with the business. Will you inquire, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. The chairman directed that the witness answer the question, but he has not replied to that.

Mr. BAXTER. I was in the process of conferring with counsel when I was interrupted by Congressman Scherer, so if I could confer—

Mr. TAVENNER. Please proceed.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, if you have an answer.

Mr. BAXTER. Thank you.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. Could I have the question read, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. I can save you the time in looking it up. It is not hard to remember. Where did you live prior to 1951?

Mr. CLARDY. That is a question you are directed to answer, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. BAXTER. That is a different question. That is not the question I was directed to answer.

Mr. CLARDY. Please don't argue with counsel. That was the question, and I now direct you to answer.

Mr. BAXTER. All right, all right, all right. I don't think, in spite of the tears rolling, that the question is relevant, and that I am compelled for any reason to respond to the question, but since you seem to be persistent, I will respond to that question. Prior to 1951, I think the question was, where did I reside. The answer to that question is, I resided in Flint, Mich.

Mr. CLARDY. You resided where?

Mr. BAXTER. Flint, Mich.

Mr. CLARDY. How long did you reside there?

Mr. BAXTER. Oh, approximately 9 years. It may be off somewhere there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, when you first came to the State of Michigan to make it your home?

Mr. BAXTER. I believe it was somewhere around 1943. I wouldn't attempt to establish a date or anything of that sort.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you advise the committee briefly what your formal educational training has been?

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. Is it all right if I have just a few more minutes? I know I am taking a long time.

Mr. CLARDY. Surely. That doesn't seem a very difficult question because he merely wants to know where you got your education. You seem to have a pretty good one. I am a little bit interested myself in discovering when you went to the University of Michigan or some of the other schools we are acquainted with.

Mr. SCHERER. And what Communist Party schools because he seems to be pretty well schooled in Communist Party tactics as displayed here this morning.

Mr. BAXTER. That is your opinion. I resent the inference.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you deny you went to a Communist Party school?

Mr. BAXTER. I resent your suggestion. I don't have to answer the question, and when you ask me I will not answer it.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct——

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, you are directed to answer the question.

Mr. BAXTER. Which question am I directed to answer at this point?

Mr. CLARDY. The last question. We will get back to the other one in a moment.

Mr. BAXTER. The last question is did I go to a Communist Party school; is that right?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

Mr. BAXTER. Well; I will refuse to answer that question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. I thought so.

Mr. BAXTER. And I will invoke the same privileges.

Mr. CLARDY. Let us get back to your education.

Mr. BAXTER. Your thoughts were correct, Congressman Scherer.

Mr. CLARDY. You may consult if you wish to do so because time is getting along, and we have a total of 17 witnesses today, and it doesn't look like we are going to get to them.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. Could I have the question restated, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Please read him the question.

The question was read by the reporter as follows:

Will you advise the committee briefly what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. BAXTER. Yes. I completed the 11th grade. I took all my formal education in the Jim Crowe South where I had to fight my way to school and away from school, and I was extremely fortunate in getting that far.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have an educational training in the city of New York?

Mr. BAXTER. I thought I said I had my educational training in Florida.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question of counsel.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, you are so directed, witness.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. CLARDY. Answer the question as to whether or not you received any part of your education in the city of New York.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. Well, let me ask this question: I have received considerable education in Detroit by reading newspapers and certain books that were available to me. Do you consider that to be education?

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course that is education, but did you attend any course of training in the city of New York?

Mr. BAXTER. I will refuse to answer that question, relying on the fifth amendment privileges and also on the first amendment which prevents this committee from inquiring into what I read, where I assemble, et cetera.

Mr. SCHERER. You answered the question about your formal training in Florida. Why do you refuse to answer then about the training you received in the city of New York?

Mr. BAXTER. Because I don't think I have to answer it; it is just that simple, and I invoke my privilege and refuse to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. No, because it happened to be training in a Communist Party school.

Mr. BAXTER. Are you accusing me, Congressman? That is not your function. That is the property of the grand jury, and I think it should be stricken from the record, any accusations this Congressman may make against me. If you have any accusation to make against me, make it in a court of law.

Mr. SCHERER. Is the accusation I made false?

Mr. BAXTER. You ain't got no right to make the accusation, and that is why I say it shouldn't go in the record.

Mr. SCHERER. I think I have, but is the accusation false?

Mr. BAXTER. I have given my answer to those questions.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct the witness to answer whether the accusation I made is false.

Mr. BAXTER. I don't have to answer accusations you make, and I will not answer accusations you make, and I will rely on the privilege I have already indicated.

Mr. CLARDY. The Congressman said to direct him. I think I should put it to him in another way with your consent.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Baxter, isn't it a fact that you did for a period of time attend a Communist training school in the city of New York? Now, I am going to give you an opportunity to deny if it is not true.

Mr. BAXTER. I don't have to deny anything before this committee. Are you reversing the due-process procedure? In other words, I am guilty until I prove myself innocent; is that what you are saying? I say, "No, that is not the situation."

Mr. CLARDY. You heard my question. Do you answer the question?

Mr. BAXTER. I have already answered the question already. I refuse to answer any questions about—I refuse to answer that particular question, let me say, relying on the fifth-amendment privileges, and I don't think any inference should be drawn from it. I refuse to answer because I am given to understand I don't have to answer it under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Baxter, did the Communist Party play any part in the establishment of the Labor Youth League—

Mr. BAXTER. Are you demanding to know whether I know or not?

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). In the State of Michigan? Yes.

Mr. BAXTER. I don't think you have that right to demand whether I know something or not. What I know is my business.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask the witness be instructed to answer the question. Let us get this in the record right.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; you are directed, but may I suggest one thing more, Mr. Baxter: you are ill serving your own cause to attempt to argue with counsel or with the committee when a question is propounded.

Mr. BAXTER. I have no cause here, Congressman. I didn't voluntarily walk in here. You sent for me, and I am saying that you are asking certain things of me that you have no right to ask, and I am going to invoke my constitutional privileges and prevent you from demanding an answer and getting it.

Mr. CLARDY. All I want to suggest is that, instead of indulging in that sort of statement and tirade, that you just say what you finished up with saying there, and we will get on with our business. We under-

stand your feelings. You have expressed them rather adequately, I think, and with that, will you proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think, Mr. Chairman, in light of the—

Mr. BAXTER. Pardon me, Counsel.

Mr. CLARDY. Just a moment.

Mr. BAXTER. Did I—

Mr. CLARDY. Just a moment. The Chair asked Mr. Tavenner to go forward.

Mr. BAXTER. Mr. Clardy, I just want to make sure—

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Baxter, this committee is in charge of this proceeding, not you. Don't get confused here.

Mr. BAXTER. I know, but there was quite an exchange.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Tavenner, will you proceed with what you had to say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, in light of the attitude of the witness, I believe I will proceed to present to the committee now and to this witness excerpts from the testimony of a witness taken in executive session—

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Relating to a study that the committee is making of the Labor Youth League in the State of Michigan as a basis for questioning of this witness—

Mr. BAXTER. Congressman, I object to having—

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of my presentation of this evidence—

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I will desire to interrupt it and ask the witness certain questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed.

Mr. BAXTER. I would object to having—

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Baxter—

Mr. BAXTER. Wait just a minute.

Mr. CLARDY. I am in control of the proceeding here.

Mr. BAXTER. I understand that, but—

Mr. CLARDY. Will you subside, please?

Mr. BAXTER. This Congressman—

Mr. CLARDY. Do not interrupt me further. I insist that you remain quiet while counsel is proceeding in an orderly way. At the proper time questions will be addressed to you, based upon sworn testimony which was taken at a hearing over which I presided. Will you proceed, Mr. Tavenner, to read that.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. CLARDY. I direct Mr. Baxter to refrain from any interruptions until a question is addressed to him. There will be no trouble or difficulty if you will obey the Chair's injunction.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the committee, as a result of its investigation, has received information that a meeting of the youth group of the Communist Party, which is to be distinguished from the Labor Youth League, met near the city of Flint around September 1, 1949. At that meeting, according to the testimony of this witness, a number of people were present, and among them this witness, Bolza Baxter. May I ask you, Mr. Baxter, to tell this committee what you know of that meeting of the youth group of the Communist Party, if you attended it.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. I would like to move that the question be stricken. I object to any testimony being introduced here by some stool pigeon who I have not had the opportunity to confront nor cross-examine. I think, if somebody is going to accuse me, I have that right, just as well as McCarthy and the rest of the people demanding it, and I object to the introduction of such testimony, and I think it should be stricken.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the questions asked by counsel.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, Mr. Baxter; you are directed to answer that question.

Mr. BAXTER. What was the question?

Mr. SCHERER. That is just a plan on his part. He knows the question as well as the rest of us.

Mr. CLARDY. Just a moment.

Mr. BAXTER. You are reading my mind now.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Baxter—

Mr. BAXTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. I have a question that will supersede the one posed. If you do not know the question, then on what basis did you say what you did immediately preceding that? You obviously are either misstating the fact as to whether you knew what the question was or you said something without any basis whatsoever. The two cannot stand. Which is it?

Mr. BAXTER. First of all, Congressman—

Mr. CLARDY. Just answer the question.

Mr. BAXTER. I am going to answer the question.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you understand the question?

Mr. BAXTER. Did I understand the question?

Mr. CLARDY. Did you understand the question?

Mr. BAXTER. I understood the question at the outset, and then there was an exchange, and then you directed me to answer the question, so I want to make sure I understand what you are directing me to answer so I can respond properly in my opinion. That was my purpose. There was no other motive involved in my asking it be restated.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed to answer the question. I am sure—and I say this knowing full well that it may invoke something from you—but I am sure that, at the time you said you didn't know the question, you did. Now, will you proceed to answer it because I am certain you know what we are trying to get at.

Mr. BAXTER. I will not answer it until I have the question restated. There has been quite an exchange, and I want to be sure what I am answering.

Mr. CLARDY. Very well; you refuse to answer. Proceed.

Mr. BAXTER. I refuse to answer, invoking my privilege under the fifth amendment and the first amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Saved by the bell.

Mr. BAXTER. Thank goodness for the bell.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is informed that 2 weeks later, near the middle of September 1949 there was a second meeting of this group called the youth group of the Communist Party, that this meeting took place in a farmhouse in Lapeer County. This meeting was at-

tended by persons other than people of the community of Flint, or the city of Flint. One person from out of town, the committee is told, was Jack Gore, who presided as chairman. At this meeting the committee was told that the youth club of the Communist Party was advised that it was to be dissolved, and from that time on the youth who were members of the youth group of the Communist Party would be, and I quote here the term used, "categorized as the Labor Youth League, and the Young Progressives." Do you know whether or not the youth group of the Communist Party was dissolved and its members were directed to get into the Labor Youth League and the Young Progressives at Flint?

Mr. BAXTER. What I know or what I do not know is my business. I don't think you have the right to demand of me what I know or what I do not know, and I will refuse to answer that question relying on my fifth amendment privileges and also the first amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend that meeting in the middle of September 1949?

Mr. BAXTER. Same answer, the same reason. Same answer, the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. The testimony on this subject was as follows:

We were told to meet on a Saturday afternoon at this farmhouse, and when we arrived, we found people from out of town there. I was quite surprised because I had thought that the meeting was more a recreational one than a business one. After we arrived the out-of-towner, Jack Gore, presided as chairman, and we were told at that time that the Communist Youth Club was being dissolved and that from now on the youth would be categorized as the Labor Youth League and the Young Progressives, often called the YP. The reason for dissolving the Communist Youth Clubs was that they felt that there was a national need for a Marxist youth organization and a national need for a youth organization whose function was a progressive one, but not necessarily a Marxist one. At this meeting it was brought out that with the trend of the times as they were, including such factors as unemployment, war, that the youth was ready to be moved into progressive channels, and yet, because of the hysteria of communism existing in the country at the time, they would be hesitant to join a known Communist group. At this meeting it was pointed out that the leaders had met previously and had discussed these questions, and it was felt that the Labor Youth League and the Young Progressives would make a far more valuable contribution than would the Communist youth if they were known as Communist youth.

Naturally there were several questions asked, one of them being, "Well, does this mean we are not Communists any more?" They were answered that, no, it did not mean that we were not Communists any more because they would still abide by the rules and regulations of the section committee and that they would still have contact with the Communist Party, but it would not be as active a contact as they would have had previous to the organization of the Labor Youth League and the Young Progressives.

QUESTION. Did you learn from any of the persons present of any action that had been taken on a national level regarding the youth work in the Communist Party?

The WITNESS. Yes, I did. In May of 1949, I understand, although I was not present at that meeting, that the national youth leaders of the Communist Party met—

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing to read):

In Chicago, on the northside, I believe. At this meeting it was decided that the Labor Youth League and the Young Progressives would be much more of a vanguard organization than the young Communists working within the framework of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. Whose testimony is being read, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Moulder, that is testimony that I took in an executive session last week, and for security reasons at this time it would be inadvisable to mention the name.

Mr. BAXTER. Do you expect me to sit here and not object to that kind of testimony?

Mr. CLARDY. Never mind, no question has been addressed to you at all, sir.

Mr. BAXTER. But there is stuff being read in the record while I am sitting here.

Mr. CLARDY. That is enough. I do not want to be compelled to do something that I am sure you would not like. Let us not have any more interruption, please. I cautioned you before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there anything about that testimony which is erroneous?

Mr. BAXTER. That is hearsay, and I don't have to refer to it or answer to it.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. CLARDY. You are directed to answer, witness.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. I will refuse to answer, invoking my fifth amendment privileges, and I further object to it being read in the record because it is hearsay. It is testimony of stool pigeons, and even a stool pigeon hasn't been presented here, and I will not answer for those reasons.

Mr. SCHERER. You don't know whose testimony that is, and you still call him a stool pigeon?

Mr. BAXTER. You wouldn't tell Congressman Moulder whose testimony it was, so I am not answering. It is hearsay as far as I am concerned.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. In light of your question I will read this question:

From whom did you learn that?

The WITNESS. I learned it from Bolza Baxter.

Now, was it true or not?

Mr. BAXTER. It is still hearsay. I refuse to answer. I invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. It is not hearsay. It is direct positive evidence taken before this committee under oath.

Mr. BAXTER. That is what you say. It wasn't taken in a court of law, and it wasn't taken before me. I haven't had the opportunity to cross examine the stool pigeon.

Mr. SCHERER. It might be dangerous to have it taken before you.

Mr. BAXTER. Well, let me take that chance. Take it in a court of law.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you are taking enough chances as it is. Get on, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. BAXTER. That is all right. Don't worry about that.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

Question. What further discussion was there at this meeting regarding the assignment of the Communist Party members to the Labor Youth League and to the Young Progressives or any other organizations?

The Witness. It was also felt at that time that if the people were broken into halves, for instance, half native young people and the other half out-of-towners, colonizers, which I am sure will be taken up later, that the Flint people could give them directions as to the environment in Flint and the

activities of Flint, the history of Flint, so therefore not all out-of-towners were put in the Young Progressives, and not all out-of-towners were put in the Labor Youth League because there had to be some that were from Flint and that were well known who could give direction to the out-of-towners.

Are you aware of a policy of the Communist Party in 1949 and 1950 in Flint which resulted in bringing people in from the city of New York and other places to colonize industry, as it was referred to at that time?

Mr. BAXTER. I am aware of the fact that there are those who made millions through the sale of comic books, dope, sex to teenagers, and who conspire by selling hatred and violence through these comic books to brutalize the young generation. I am aware of that.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, witness, you are directed to answer the question.

Mr. BAXTER. I object to the introduction of that testimony on the grounds that it is hearsay.

Mr. TAVENNER. He is not answering the question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BAXTER. And I will refuse to answer any question that has to do with it, relying on my privileges under the fifth amendment and the first amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Very well. I am moved to remark at this time, because of something the witness said—and this does not call for any comment by you, Mr. Baxter—that at the hearing last year in Los Angeles it developed that the Communist Party was using comic books as far down the scale as from the kindergarten on up to sell the Communist Party line. So what the witness had to say had a little familiar ring to me.

Mr. BAXTER. Do you have any evidence of that?

Mr. CLARDY. At this moment I am going to call a 5-minute recess to give the reporter a breathing spell.

(Whereupon, at 11:05 a. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 11:10 a. m.)

(Whereupon, at 11:12 a. m., the hearing was reconvened.)

Mr. CLARDY. The committee will be in order. The hearing will resume.

Mr. BAXTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to move at this time that all the hearsay testimony be stricken from the record on the grounds that the rules of procedure set up by this committee provides that testimony taken in secret executive session must have approval of the majority of the members of the committee. I don't take it that there has been that majority approval, and on those grounds I move that it be stricken.

Mr. CLARDY. Motion denied. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

Question. Will you tell the committee, please, who were present at this meeting as far as you can recall?

The meeting referred to was a meeting of the Communist youth group of the Communist Party.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. I will refuse to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is no question.

Mr. BAXTER. Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is a question propounded to this witness. The witness replied in part, "Bolza Baxter, who was assigned to the Labor Youth League as its chairman."

Were you assigned to the Labor Youth League at Flint as its chairman in September 1949?

Mr. BAXTER. I will invoke the fifth amendment privilege and refuse to answer that question.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

Question. Were there any special qualifications considered in assigning persons to one group or the other; that is, to the Labor Youth League or the Young Progressives?

Answer. I mentioned some of them earlier, and that was whether they were residents of Flint in that division there. Some of the people had worked with the Young Progressives at the time of the Wallace campaign and were assigned to Young Progressives because they were active in this particular work, either in New York or in Michigan. The Young Progressives was to assume a different role than the Labor Youth League, as I have explained before. Its members were younger. They were to work with the students in Flint. Some of them were more sociable in that they had more organizational ability in social affairs. The crux of the whole situation right here is that the Young Progressives were a non-Marxist group, but they were given the understanding that they should develop young Marxists out of this group, to develop enough progressives within the Young Progressives to bring them over to the Labor Youth League, and from the Labor Youth League there would be few, perhaps very few, would become young Marxists. In other words, the level of the political progressiveness of a person determined what organization they went into. There were other considerations also, but this was the primary function.

Question. Were any Communist Party functionaries present at the meeting of September 1949 which you have been describing?

Answer. Yes, there was a Jack Gore. He was the chairman, State chairman, of the Labor Youth League, and Jack White, known as John White, who was the local functionary chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. May I interrupt you at this point. Since there is a Jack White of very prominent fame here in town, we had better make it clear you are not speaking of WJR's Jack White.

Mr. TAVENNER. This was in Flint.

"What type of functionary was Mr. White?" was the next question.

Answer. Well, as far as I understand, he was the chairman of the Communist Party for Flint and the northern section.

Question. The northern section of the Communist Party?

Answer. Well, it was the northern section of Michigan. I mean he had Flint which was the biggest city, but I believe that he also contacted other people in Saginaw.

Question. Who was the leader of the Labor Youth League?

Answer. In Flint?

Question. In Flint.

Answer. Bolza Baxter. Bolza Baxter was elected chairman of the Flint Labor Youth League in Detroit, Mich., in June of 1949.

Is that correct?

Mr. BAXTER. I again object to the hearsay and refuse to answer the question on the fifth-amendment privileges.

Mr. TAVENNER. A question was asked of the witness to describe what went on at the meeting in Detroit in June of 1949, to which the witness answered:

Various aspects of the organization of the Labor Youth League were discussed pro and con, what the function of the Labor Youth League would be, as I have described previously. This was a State meeting of the Labor Youth League, organization of the Labor Youth League. This was a direct result of the May meeting which I have described previously that was held in Chicago on the

North Side. The September meeting was a result of this June meeting. It was pointed out how important the Flint area was in the progressive movement. It was pointed out that Flint was one of the first cities to organize in the trade-unions, and, with the proper approach and with proper leadership, the potential was great. The person who could be best fitted for this task and who was a Negro was Bolza Baxter. It was pointed out that the chairmanship should be assumed by a Negro because of the presentation of the Negroes, and it would clearly indicate that the Labor Youth League, a Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist organization, clearly was a friend of the Negro people of Flint. So therefore Jack Gore was assigned as State chairman, and Bolza Baxter was assigned as the Flint chairman of the Labor Youth League.

Is that statement correct with regard to you?

Mr. BAXTER. I again object to having that read into the record for the reasons stated, and I invoke my first and fifth amendment privileges and refuse to answer that question.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

Question. Was the functioning of Communist Party members discussed at this meeting?

Answer. Yes, they were. The Communists—and this is a difficult thing to explain—were to function within the organizations in which they were assigned. If a person were assigned to the Labor Youth League, he would function within the realm of the Labor Youth League. He would be a Communist first and always. His ideology, his way of life, his organizational ability within the Labor Youth League, would remain on a Communist pattern, but the Labor Youth League was not considered a Communist organization, and it was never to be considered a Communist organization, but the leadership was Communist, had intended to be Communist, and they were to give direction to the people that were not Communists within the Labor Youth League. Basically the Labor Youth League was considered a Marxist-Leninist organization, and a working-class organization, but the Communists within the Labor Youth League were to function as Communists within that organization.

Question. After becoming a member of the Communist Party did you learn whether or not the officials of the Labor Youth League were in fact members of the Communist Party?

Answer. Yes. The leadership of the Labor Youth League was in fact and for all purposes members of the Communist Party. The officers of the Labor Youth League were always elected Communists. The meetings were such that because they took the initiative they would naturally be elected as its officers.

Mr. Baxter, were you aware of Communist Party leadership within the Labor Youth League in Flint?

Mr. BAXTER. Again I object to having that read into the record, and I will refuse to answer that question, relying on my first and fifth amendment privileges.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

Question. Will you describe to the committee, please, how the Labor Youth League functioned?

The answer in part is as follows:

The Labor Youth League's role was to recruit young people of a working-class background. They were not interested in procuring memberships from sororities, from church groups who were not in sympathy with them, but with church groups who had a congregation of working-class background. The Labor Youth League was to attract these young persons, not through literature directly, but through a broad social and cultural program.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

Question. To what extent, if any, were the meetings planned and organized in advance by members of the Communist Party?

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. TAVENNER. The reply was as follows:

The educational classes were publicized, and enrollment blanks were sent out that there would be a discussion, for instance, on Negro rights. Negro young people would be invited to attend. It was assumed that the known Communists would attend the meeting along with the non-Communists who had just come to the meeting out of curiosity—

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

Or perhaps they were just free that evening or a friend of theirs was attending. The classes would start out simply by saying to perhaps a young Negro who was attending: "Do you think that you have full Negro rights under the Constitution of the United States? After all, in the Constitution"—they would use this—"it says 'life, liberty, and justice for all.' Do you think that you have justice?" The answer would usually be in a negative phase because a young student would not know how to answer it. Understandably he couldn't say "Yes" and understandably he couldn't very well say "No." He didn't know why the question was being asked. Then a young Negro comrade would say, "Well, I don't think I have got my rights. They will make one a foreman that hasn't been working there as long as I have. I can't live on the same side of the street as the white people. I don't think I have my rights. Do you think you have yours?"

Then naturally the young Negro student would say "No." From this line of questioning there would be other subjects entered into the discussion, such as "What do you think of the Ku Klux Klan?" Naturally they would disapprove of the Ku Klux Klan. Before you knew what would happen, the solution to the question was Marxist, and most generally the young Negro students would agree to the Marxist solution to the question. All in all, the Communists controlled the educational classes because they had the answers. There was no give and take because if a young student happened to disagree, there were many young Communists there that were only too numerous and only too willing to show him how he was wrong. The young student would be outnumbered.

Question. Who were the principal leaders in the Labor Youth League who took charge of these educational meetings or so-called educational meetings?

Among those named by the witness was Bolza Baxter. Mr. Baxter, does that description adequately portray the activities of the Labor Youth League in Flint insofar as you were concerned?

Mr. BAXTER. I object. It is hearsay. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment, the first amendment, and refuse to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading).

Question. Do you know how the work within the Labor Youth League in Flint compared with the work of that organization throughout the State generally?

Answer. The Labor Youth League of Flint was considered the most successful and militant league in the State of Michigan. Very often Jack Gore, State chairman, would commend Flint for the excellent job that was being done. Very often they would cite Flint as an example as what could be done with groups of people. This success was attributed to Mr. Baxter; that is, Bolza Baxter, and his militant leadership. The Labor Youth League in Flint was the only one that had its separate headquarters; it was the only one that maintained a separate office, and it was financially very successful, often contributing to the State Labor Youth League. The Labor Youth League in Flint was the one that had the most constructive educational program, the most constructive social program, and the most successful in its membership per ratio of the population of Flint. It was the league that was often commended for the element of working-class youths who were members. A good 70 percent of them or 75 percent of them were factory workers, and a good majority were young Negro members.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

Question. Did any local members of the Labor Youth League receive State or national recognition for their services?

Answer. Yes, they did.

Question. Will you tell the committee about that?

Answer. Bolza Baxter received State and national recognition.

Question. In what form?

He was later appointed State chairman.

Does that description adequately portray your activities within the Labor Youth League in Flint, Mr. Baxter?

Mr. BAXTER. I object against the hearsay being introduced into the record. Relying on the first and fifth amendment, I refuse to answer.

Mr. CLARDY. I think perhaps at this juncture I should correct your impression. It is obvious that—

Mr. BAXTER. Whose impression, mine?

Mr. CLARDY. Not being an attorney, you are not aware of what constitutes hearsay. This is sworn testimony taken before me by a person who was testifying on the basis of firsthand knowledge of the statements being made. Now, hearsay consists of someone relating something they have heard from someone else. I tell you that so while you can raise it if you want, that is not hearsay.

Mr. BAXTER. That is your interpretation of the word. I think it is different.

Mr. CLARDY. I understand that you as an ordinary civilian and not an attorney may differ with me, and that is your privilege. Will you proceed?

Mr. BAXTER. I definitely differ, Congressman. I have not been confronted by the stool pigeon.

Mr. CLARDY. You are being confronted with the sworn testimony of a witness who was—

Mr. BAXTER. Which hasn't been approved by the full committee.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Present at the time and places mentioned in the testimony.

Mr. BAXTER. It is not subject to cross-examination.

Mr. CLARDY. You will have before this is through an ample opportunity to discover a lot of other things, too. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Baxter, I hand you a pamphlet entitled "Meet the Communists." Have you ever seen that pamphlet before or one like it?

Mr. BAXTER. Are you demanding to know what I have seen in my lifetime?

Mr. CLARDY. You are directed to answer that question.

Mr. BAXTER. Well, I will refuse to answer it, relying on the first amendment privileges and the fifth amendment. I don't think this committee has a right to demand to know what I have seen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in the activity of distributing that pamphlet among the schoolchildren of Flint, Mich., in April of 1948?

Mr. BAXTER. Is that a question directed to me?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BAXTER. I refuse to answer, invoking the fifth amendment privileges.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you hold any official position in the Communist Party at this time?

Mr. BAXTER. My politics is my business. I am not admitting any political affiliations before this committee, and I will refuse to answer your question, invoking the first amendment and the fifth amendment privileges.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BAXTER. The same answer to that question for the same reason. I think it is the same question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BAXTER. Well, for the sake of being monotonous, I repeat, I will refuse to answer that question, relying on the first amendment and fifth amendment privileges. My politics is my business; it is private.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. How many years have you been on the payroll of the Communist Party?

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. That is an accusation which I don't think you are authorized to make. You aren't a witness sworn to give testimony against me whom I am permitted to cross-examine, and I will refuse to answer that question, invoking my first amendment privileges and fifth amendment privileges.

Mr. SCHERER. It was a question, but assuming that it was an accusation, as you claim it to be, was the accusation true or false?

Mr. BAXTER. I would assume that since it was an accusation, and you aren't authorized to make accusations, then you should withdraw the accusation.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you answer the question, please, witness. He asked you whether the statement which you said you regarded as an accusation was true or false.

Mr. BAXTER. I am not obligated to answer any such question or any such charge by Congressman Scherer, and I will invoke the fifth amendment privileges and refuse to answer that question.

Mr. CLARDY. Any questions, Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. I have one question to ask. What is your definition of a stoolpigeon?

Mr. BAXTER. Well, I would say that a stoolpigeon is lower than a snake and would do anything for a price, would lie and cheat, and would lie on their mother, if necessary. They are the lowest creatures on the face of the earth, and I would not dignify them by even considering any allegation that they may make.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. BAXTER. And before we are concluded—

Mr. CLARDY. We are not through with you yet.

Mr. BAXTER. All right. I just want to make this point.

Mr. CLARDY. No; you are not being asked any question now. I have a question or two to ask you, though, if Mr. Moulder has concluded. I don't imagine you are satisfied with that attempt, but we will pass it. Mr. Baxter, some time ago did you not release a statement to the newspapers dealing with the service of the committee's subpoena upon you in which you admitted that you were the chairman of the Labor Youth League? I am just asking you if you didn't release such a statement.

Mr. BAXTER. Well, I am going to answer you.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I hope you are.

Mr. BAXTER. Any statement that I may or may not have issued comes under the first amendment privileges. I consider that freedom

of speech, and I don't have to answer before this committee for anything I said to the press or outside of these hearing rooms, just like you don't have to answer for the claim that we rehearsed the disruption of the proceedings on Monday.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, come back to my question.

Mr. BAXTER. And I will refuse to answer that question.

Mr. CLARDY. Was there a news release—listen to my question. Was there a news release put out by you and published in the press in which you stated that you were the chairman of the LYL? Now, I direct you to answer that because I think that you are not entitled to the privilege under the fifth amendment, so I direct that you answer.

Mr. BAXTER. Well, I think I am entitled to the privilege in refusing to answer any questions that has to do with speeches I may have made or statements that I may have issued, invoking the first and fifth amendments and refusing to answer that question.

Mr. CLARDY. All right. Very well.

(At this point Mr. Baxter conferred with Mr. Henry.)

Mr. CLARDY. Did you not attend a convention of the Labor Youth League on March 22 last year, 1953, at which you were introduced as chairman of that group?

Mr. BAXTER. I think any question that has to do with any meeting that I may or may not have attended is purely personal and private and is prohibited—your question is prohibited by the first amendment. I invoke that amendment and also invoke the fifth amendment privileges and refuse to answer that question.

Mr. CLARDY. Was not that convention held at Jericho Temple at 2705 Joy Road and were you not introduced by Tom Dennis, one of the Smith Act defendants who was recently convicted?

Mr. BAXTER. Same answer for the same reasons.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have any further questions, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness excused. The subpena as to you is not dismissed, but you are excused from the stand, so there will be no misunderstanding in your mind. You will be subject to further call of the committee if it desires to do so after studying this record.

Mr. BAXTER. I just wanted to add this point.

Mr. CLARDY. Dismissed for the day. No, the witness is dismissed. Call your next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bernard Bellinson.

Mr. CLARDY. You do solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BELLINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. You may be seated. I see you are accompanied by counsel. Will you identify yourselves for the record?

Mr. SCHNAAR. My name is Mitchell Schnaar. S-c-h-n-a-a-r. As to the photographers, Congressman, I would like—

Mr. CLARDY. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. State your name?

TESTIMONY OF BERNARD BELLINSON, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS
COUNSEL, MITCHELL SCHNAAR

Mr. BELLINSON. My name is Bernard Bellinson.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. BELLINSON. Excuse me. I have a statement that I would like to put into the record at this time.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, you will answer the question. If you do answer the questions and have a relevant statement, at the conclusion of your testimony you may be afforded the opportunity, but the statement will have to be germane, but it will not be permitted unless and until you have answered the questions propounded to you.

Mr. BELLINSON. Can I please say something?

Mr. CLARDY. You may not say anything yet.

Mr. BELLINSON. But this is my answer to all the questions about this committee.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, witness, please refrain from interrupting me or counsel at any time. You were present when I admonished the prior witness, I am sure, and you understand that in order to conduct this business in the proper atmosphere and in the proper way, one of us have to speak at a time, no more. You will not be permitted, I repeat, to make any self-serving statement of any kind until the conclusion of your testimony, and only then in the event that you have answered the questions and not refused to answer on the fifth or so other amendment, so proceed.

Mr. BELLINSON. Congressman, you let the other witnesses make a statement or present a statement into the record.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, I will not entertain any further statement of any kind at this time until you have answered the question. Now, we are more than patient, and we will not in anyway cut you off if you follow the procedure that I outlined. But you must obey the rules. We cannot have it any other way. Will you proceed, Mr. Tavenner, and reask your question?

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. BELLINSON. I was born January 25, 1928, in a hospital in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. BELLINSON. 3221 Gladstone.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the city of Detroit?

Mr. BELLINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in the city of Detroit?

Mr. BELLINSON. Approximately 5 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that mean that you came to Michigan in 1949 or 1950?

Mr. BELLINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived in Detroit the entire period since your arrival in Michigan?

(At this point Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. BELLINSON. I refuse to answer that question on the privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your purpose in leaving New York and coming to the great State of Michigan?

Mr. BELLINSON. Well, you see, attorney, I had to make a living because my parents, my father, was out of a job, and for that reason I came here. There was work at that time, and economically and for the higher standard of living I decided to come here.

Mr. TAVERNER. Did you have any other reason?

Mr. CLARDY. Would you repeat that, witness? I didn't relate that to a proper date. What date was that?

Mr. BELLINSON. What?

Mr. TAVERNER. That you came here.

Mr. BELLINSON. The attorney said what date it was. I said approximately 5 years.

Mr. CLARDY. Thank you.

Mr. TAVERNER. Did you have any other reason for coming to Detroit?

(At this point Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. BELLINSON. I respectfully decline to answer that question under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVERNER. Weren't you directed in the city of New York what nature of employment you should seek in Detroit?

Mr. BELLINSON. Same answer, same question.

(At this point Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. BELLINSON. Same reason.

Mr. TAVERNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party before coming to Detroit?

Mr. BELLINSON. At this time I would like to answer this question in the following manner: I respectfully refuse to answer this or similar questions of this character for the following reasons: No. 1, the question violates the freedom of press, speech, and assembly guaranteed to all individuals in the first amendment to the Constitution which this committee is trying to deprive me of; No. 2, this committee spreads hysteria, fear, intimidation and is in direct violation of the ninth and tenth amendments which give Congress the right to be a legislative and not a judicial body, and this is a public trial where due process of law is being deprived; No. 3, this question violates the right of privilege as granted in the fourth amendment; No. 4, this question violates the fifth and sixth amendments which guarantee that no person shall be denied life, liberty, and property without due process of law, trial by jury, the right to know the nature and cause of the accusation, the right to confront and cross-examine the accusers by your attorney which are denied by this committee. This committee violates all constitutional rights and legal court proceedings and is only a star chamber inquisitorial hearing. I further refuse this or other questions of this character for these reasons and primarily on my fifth amendment privilege.

Mr. TAVERNER. Are you aware of any policy on the part of the Communist Party to engage in what has been frequently termed colonization of industry by the Communist Party?

Mr. BELLINSON. Same answer, for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVERNER. By "colonization of industry" I mean the change of your occupation and your entering a field in which the Communist Party desires one to enter. You understand the meaning of it.

Mr. BELLINSON. I just heard the testimony of some hearsay witness before a one-man hearing—everybody disagrees with one-man

hearings—and that is what was said by some witness in a closed executive session, and I understand what that—

Mr. TAVENNER. You understand what it means?

Mr. BELLINSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you ever heard that before that time?

(At this point Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. SCHERER. Have you ever heard of colonization before?

Mr. BELLINSON. Same answer, same question.

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute. You never heard of colonization before you heard the testimony of the witness read to this morning?

Mr. BELLINSON. Same answer, same question—same reasons.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact is, you knew about it in 1949 or 1950 when you came over here at the direction of the Communist Party as a part of the group to colonize certain Detroit basic industry, did you not?

(At this point Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. BELLINSON. Congressman, if you would like to testify, I would gladly relinquish my chair for you, but you—

Mr. SCHERER. Did your lawyer tell you to say that now? About my testifying?

Mr. BELLINSON. But you have the right of congressional immunity, and you can say anything you want here, and you can't be sued.

Mr. SCHERER. Is what I said true or false?

Mr. BELLINSON. What are you trying to do? Are you trying to change the whole due-process-of-law provisions in the Constitution?

Mr. SCHERER. I think I understand due process.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, answer the question that Congressman Scherer propounded.

Mr. SCHERER. Is what I said true or false?

Mr. CLARDY. The same answer for the same reasons that I have said before.

Mr. TAVENNER. What employment did you obtain when you came to Detroit?

Mr. BELLINSON. I worked at Briggs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you hold an official position in your union?

(At this point Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me withdraw that question for the moment. You are not employed by Briggs at this time, are you?

Mr. BELLINSON. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where are you employed now?

(At this point Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. BELLINSON. I work at the Ford Motor Co. Rouge plant.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you begin your employment with the Ford Motor Co.?

Mr. BELLINSON. The exact date I am not sure. I think it is about December 26, 1949.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1949?

Mr. BELLINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was very soon after you arrived in Detroit, was it not?

Mr. BELLINSON. No, I wouldn't say it was very soon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, how long was it after you arrived here before you got employment in that plant?

Mr. BELLINSON. Well, I had different jobs before I worked at Ford.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. How long, I say, was it?

Mr. BELLINSON. Oh, a couple of months.

Mr. TAVENNER. A couple of months?

Mr. BELLINSON. I was laid off, and I went to apply for another job. That is what I did, and that is why I had different jobs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any instruction prior to your coming to the city of Detroit that you were to obtain a position in a basic industry?

Mr. BELLINSON. I refuse to answer that question based on my fifth-amendment privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. What type of work were you doing in New York before you came to Detroit?

Mr. BELLINSON. Well, I had many part-time jobs. I am only 26 years old, Congressman, and I was in the Army, and it doesn't leave me very much—very many years.

Mr. SCHERER. I understand, but what type of work were you doing before you came to Detroit?

Mr. BELLINSON. I had different types of—

Mr. SCHERER. What was your last job?

Mr. BELLINSON. Well, working in a grocery store.

Mr. SCHERER. What was the one before that?

Mr. BELLINSON. I mean, they have all been part-time jobs that I have had, and with school, I don't remember. I have worked since I have been 12 years old, so I don't know.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, you and I have something in common then. That is about the only thing.

Mr. BELLINSON. The only difference of you and I is that, you see, my record is known to the public, and I am not afraid of my record. But you won't admit your record. Yesterday you asked one of the witnesses about public housing. Did you vote against the public housing bill in Congress?

Mr. CLARDY. Now that will be just about enough, witness.

Do you folks in the audience want to attend this afternoon or not? And I am in deadly earnest. Those doors are going to remain closed this afternoon if I hear one more demonstration of that kind, and none of you will be admitted other than the people that are to be called as witnesses or their attorneys. This may be a humorous proceeding to some of you sitting in the audience. It is not such to the Congress of the United States, and, thank God, to the vast majority of the people in this country.

(At this point Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. CLARDY. We will not tolerate any more demonstrations. I repeat it, we will not tolerate it. Now, will you resume.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes. What was the first job you had when you came to Detroit?

Mr. BELLINSON. I worked at Briggs.

Mr. SCHERER. And what type of work did you do at Briggs?

Mr. BELLINSON. I worked in the shipping department.

Mr. CLARDY. May I interject? Then when you came here, the type of work that you did was somewhat of a change from the work you had been doing in New York?

Mr. BELLINSON. No, I looked for different types of jobs, and I worked at the Jewish Community Center for a while, and I looked for

a job which would pay me sufficient amount of money—you see, I am not satisfied if I would make \$50 a week, and you know, yourself, that—

Mr. CLARDY. You didn't answer my question.

Mr. BELLINSON. That because of the unions today there is a higher standard of living in the automobile industry than there is in the grocery store.

Mr. CLARDY. Now to come back to my question. You did, then, drift into a different line of employment than you had followed in New York, didn't you?

Mr. BELLINSON. I looked for a job where I would make sufficient amount of money—

Mr. CLARDY. All right, if you won't answer the question. Proceed, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, the fact is that you were directed to go to the Ford plant to seek employment, wasn't that the fact?

Mr. BELLINSON. I refuse to answer that question based on my fifth amendment privilege.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, to be specific, you were directed by the Communist Party to seek that for the purposes of the party, were you not?

Mr. BELLINSON. You see, you have congressional immunity here.

Mr. CLARDY. Just answer the question, Witness. Were you not directed by the Communist Party and no one else to seek employment in the motor industry in Detroit in order to further the interests of the Communist Party?

(At this point Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. SCHERER. Specifically, local 600 at the Ford plant.

Mr. CLARDY. Now either answer or decline.

Mr. BELLINSON. I was laid off from work, and I went to look for a job, and the Ford Motor Co. hired me, and that is the answer, and for any other reason I use my fifth amendment privilege.

Mr. CLARDY. Very well. Proceed, Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your educational training?

Mr. CLARDY. I went to public school, I went to high school, I went 2 years to college.

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't catch that, three?

Mr. BELLINSON. Approximately 2 years to college.

Mr. CLARDY. Two years?

Mr. BELLINSON. Approximately, yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What college?

Mr. BELLINSON. New York University.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BELLINSON. I thought that I answered those questions before, and I state again here that I refuse to answer that question on the basis of the 1st, the 4th, the 6th, the 9th, the 10th, and primarily on my 5th amendment privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BELLINSON. Same answer, same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. I just wanted to know, what are your duties of employment now at Ford?

Mr. BELLINSON. I work on the assembly line.

Mr. MOULDER. And to be more specific what is the exact work that you perform?

Mr. BELLINSON. Well, I work on the assembly line. I mean, do you want me to show you what I do?

Mr. MOULDER. Well, no, I mean what part of the assembly?

Mr. BELLINSON. Building motors.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you belong to local 600?

(At this point, Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. SCHERER. Local 600, UAW?

(At this point Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. BELLINSON. I think it has been in the papers before what union I belong to, and I think it is a matter of public knowledge what union I belong to, and I refuse to answer any question based on my fifth-amendment privilege.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, Witness, may I tell you that having stated as you did that it is a matter of public knowledge that you are such, you do not and will not have the benefit of the fifth amendment. I accordingly direct you to answer that question.

(At this point Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. BELLINSON. I said it was a matter of public record what union I may belong to, and I refuse to answer any further question on the grounds of the fifth amendment privilege and the reasons that I have stated previously.

Mr. CLARDY. I have a question. It is my understanding, and I want you to tell me whether it is correct or not, that at the time the international administrator took over for a period of time local 600, that you and a number of others were removed from your positions in the union because of Communist affiliations. Now, is that or is that not correct?

Mr. BELLINSON. Anything that goes on in my union or in any union is not the business of this committee, and I refuse to answer any questions in relationship to my union or any union on the fifth-amendment privilege, and the other reasons that I have given before.

Mr. CLARDY. Any further questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVERNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. BELLINSON. At this time I would like to present this statement to the committee to put into the record.

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon just a moment. Mr. Moulder? Mr. Moulder has some questions.

Mr. MOULDER. I wanted to ask you, when you came to Detroit seeking employment, who recommended you for your position of employment at the Ford Motor Co.?

Mr. BELLINSON. I don't know what you are implying by that question, but I, as other thousands of workers who are unemployed today, would go to work at any place where there was hiring. I was laid off at that time, I had a part-time job at the Jewish Community Center, and for that reason I was interested in making more money as everybody else is.

Mr. MOULDER. To whom did you apply for employment at the Ford Motor Co.?

Mr. BELLINSON. I went to the employment office.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you remember the person you discussed your application with?

Mr. BELLINSON. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you a member then of the union of which you are now a member?

(At this point Mr. Bellinson conferred with Mr. Schnaar.)

Mr. BELLINSON. As I stated before, my union activities are the business of the union and it has nothing to do with this committee's hearing, and I refuse to answer that question based on my fifth-amendment privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Again I ask you, witness, if it isn't a fact that you sought employment at the Ford plant and eventually obtained it as a result of a directive to you by the Communist Party?

Mr. BELLINSON. Same answer, same reasons.

Mr. CLARDY. Any further questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness dismissed. The committee stands in recess until 1:30.

Mr. BELLINSON. I would just like to make a statement here.

Mr. CLARDY. The record is closed. We will recess.

(Thereupon, at 12:02 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 1:30 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 1:35 p. m. of the same day, the proceedings were resumed, Representatives Kit Clardy (acting chairman), Gordon H. Scherer, and Morgan M. Moulder being present.)

Mr. CLARDY. The hearing will resume. Are you ready, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. Mr. William H. Johnson, will you come forward, please?

Mr. CLARDY. Will you raise your right hand? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do.

Mr. CLARDY. Since you are accompanied by counsel, will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. FRANKLIN. Godfrey Franklin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I don't have counsel. This happens to be a personal friend of mine, and, if the committee has no objection, I would wish that he would be permitted to sit here with me.

Mr. CLARDY. You may be accompanied that way if you wish. I intended that statement as a compliment. Don't take it in any other way, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM H. JOHNSON, ACCOMPANIED BY GODFREY FRANKLIN

Mr. JOHNSON. William H. Johnson.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Johnson?

Mr. JOHNSON. Born in Nashville, Tenn., on November 1, 1916.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. JOHNSON. 2296 West Boston Boulevard.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the city of Detroit?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in the city of Detroit?

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, since 1927, March of 1927.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your educational training has been?

Mr. JOHNSON. I am a graduate of Wayne University Law School.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the year in which you received your degree?

Mr. JOHNSON. 1952, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been admitted to the practice of law?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, I haven't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Johnson, the investigation conducted by the committee indicates you have held a number of responsible positions in your union. What union is it that you are a member of?

Mr. JOHNSON. Local 600, UAW-CIO.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are the positions that you have held, the principal positions you have held, in local 600 of the UAW?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, within the unit and within the local union I have been a member of the bargaining committee several times. I have been the recording secretary of the local union—this is the third time that I have held that position over the years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are those terms for 2 years each?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, this is the first 2-year term that we have had. It started last year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you have been recording secretary for either 3 or 4 years?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, 2 previous terms, 1 in 1946—well, I was first elected in 1946. Then I was reelected in 1947, and then I was elected last year, 1953.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you held any other position in your local union besides that of recording secretary since 1946?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, since 1946 I was twice president of one of the units, the Dearborn iron foundry unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. What years were you president of those units?

Mr. JOHNSON. 1950 was the first term and 1952 the second term.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Johnson, the committee has been investigating for some period of time the objectives of the Communist Party and their efforts to infiltrate various organizations in the United States, including labor unions. I would like to ask you if, during the period of your vast experience in the union, you have had occasion to learn of an effort on the part of the Communist Party to become active within the framework of your union?

Mr. JOHNSON. I would appreciate it if you would make the question a little more specific. That is a pretty general question, calling for a pretty general answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, it is, but I think it is susceptible of an answer. In other words, what I want to know is whether or not you know whether the Communist Party has endeavored to exercise its influence and its control within the framework of your union?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, as a leader within the local union and as a political individual within the local union, I have heard rumors, but

to just make a flat statement "Yes" or "No," that is quite a difficult thing to do. I know of other organizations that have, through rumor or allegation or—

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, of course, you are a person directly connected with this union in a responsible position.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would think you would be in a position to know without having to rely upon rumor.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, that question to me seems to imply that I would be in a position to know what the activities of the Communist Party are. About all that I could see of those types of activities are what I have read about in newspapers. I mean, those are things of such a general nature.

Mr. TAVENNER. To make it more specific—

Mr. JOHNSON. I would appreciate it.

Mr. TAVENNER. To make it more specific, during the year that you were president, for instance, of the Dearborn—

Mr. JOHNSON. Iron foundry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Iron foundry, did any member of the Communist Party endeavor to take any action tending to influence the conduct of the affairs of the union to your knowledge?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, to answer that question would make it a prime requisite that I would be able to identify who was and who wasn't a member of the Communist Party. I couldn't do that.

Mr. TAVENNER. You cannot tell the committee anything about the activities of the Communist Party within your union? You don't mean to say that; do you?

Mr. JOHNSON. Frankly, I still wish you would make the question more specific because I can't identify who is a Communist and who isn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, has anyone—

Mr. JOHNSON. I mean, if someone would stand up in a membership meeting while I was chairing the meeting and make a motion, I couldn't say that he is a Communist or he is not a Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, let us put the question this way: In the practical operation of the affairs of your union—and by asking these questions I want it plainly understood that I am not endeavoring to inquire as to any intraunion dispute or affair, but only for the purpose of ascertaining the methods of operation of the Communist Party and the extent of its success or failure. Now, in the way in which your union transacts its business, do you have a group which you call the progressive caucus of your union?

Mr. JOHNSON. We have a progressive caucus; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have been a member of it, haven't you?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have been chairman of it, haven't you?

Mr. JOHNSON. Never the local caucus; no. I can't recall that I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, have you been chairman of the—

Mr. JOHNSON. I was chairman of a unit caucus.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the unit caucus?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. .

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you chairman of the unit caucus?

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, I guess that would go all the way from about—from 1945 up to, oh, the last time I was chairman. By that, let me explain this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was always chairman of my own caucus. It was more commonly called the Bill Johnson caucus. That was the caucus composed of people who supported me for either election or reelection. Every candidate had his own caucus, so to speak.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; but what we were speaking of was the progressive caucus which you mentioned a moment ago. You said you had been chairman of the progressive caucus of the unit?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; at times.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean; within the unit?

Mr. JOHNSON. Within the building, within the particular building.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that mean Dearborn?

Mr. JOHNSON. Within the foundry, foundry building.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would that caucus meet prior to action that was being taken by your union on various matters?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; that caucus met whenever I called it to meet, and we met on problems that were essential to the unit, such as a caucus would generally decide who they were going to run for unit officers, the same as my political caucus does.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, was there an inner caucus within your progressive caucus?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, there might have been. I didn't know anything about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You wouldn't know?

Mr. JOHNSON. I guess there are caucuses within every caucus. I guess it is safe to say that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, do you know of any inner caucus in which the members of the Communist Party have participated within your unit?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Not to your knowledge?

Mr. JOHNSON. I mean everything the members of the caucus had to say, they would say it at the meeting. If 3 or 4 individuals would decide to step outside the caucus and think of some other things or plan to do some other things, I wouldn't have any way of knowing that, the same as if it was a Republican or Democratic caucus. I couldn't answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where would you hold the caucus meeting?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, generally wherever we could get a place to meet, wherever we could get a place to meet. We would sometimes meet in the basement of one of the fellows' homes if he had a large basement. Generally, the consideration we were concerned with was that no one had too much money to pay for a meeting hall, and wherever we could get a reasonably cheap place to meet, some place that would cost \$2, \$3, \$5, something like that, we would meet. We didn't have any particular place to meet. We didn't meet that often.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever meet in Communist headquarters?

Mr. JOHNSON. Never to my recollection. We may have met in some place that might have been supposed to have been, I don't know. You would have to identify the place.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask: Wouldn't you oppose any effort on the part of the Communists to dominate or control or influence organized labor or unions?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Or your union?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. You say you would?

Mr. JOHNSON. I would.

Mr. MOULDER. Of course, I, myself, am in favor of organized labor and support it, and I think it is an essential part of our economy and a must and necessity for our country and protection of the laboring people to have strong, organized unions.

I am happy to hear you say, for the protection of organized labor and for its best interest, that you oppose any Communist influence within organized labor.

Mr. JOHNSON. I certainly would.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you done so?

Mr. JOHNSON. To the best of my knowledge I believe I have.

Mr. MOULDER. In further commenting on that, as you know, of course, the aim of communism is to ultimately destroy organized labor and unions because they are not tolerated in the Soviet Union.

Mr. CLARDY. Was that not in the form of a question?

Mr. MOULDER. No; I made that comment.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you agree with the comment of Congressman Moulder?

Mr. JOHNSON. To the——

Mr. CLARDY. To the general effect that the Communist Party is obviously dedicated to the destruction of the union movement when once they gain power and control?

Mr. JOHNSON. I have heard a lot of evidence to that effect.

Mr. CLARDY. Is that your honest belief?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think I would subscribe to that.

Mr. MOULDER. And, in further commenting, it is my opinion that organized labor has made every effort and successfully so, to rid itself of Communist influence in this country.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is true.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, they have; in a great many places. Of course, there are still, as we all know, some places where the fight is still going on, and it hasn't reached a complete victory for those who do oppose it. There is no need to go into details, but I am sure you will agree maybe that there are still some sore spots scattered about the Nation in some of the union groups, and we, on this committee are doing our best to try to help those who would root them out, as Congressman Scherer suggested to me here.

Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. What motor plant was it in which your local had jurisdiction?

Mr. JOHNSON. You mean what company?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Ford Motor Co.; Rouge plant.

(At this point Mr. Johnson conferred with Mr. Franklin.)

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has received information that Phil Schatz and James Jackson were full-time Communist Party employees

assigned to the Ford section of the Communist Party. Did you ever meet with either or both of them in connection with the business of your union?

Mr. JOHNSON. I believe I met with Jackson once. I don't recall whether Schatz was present or not. It was on the question of speedup or something like that, within the unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is also advised that William Allan, Carl Winter, and Ned Ganley—

Mr. JOHNSON. What Ganley was that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Ned Ganley. Am I incorrect in the first name?

Mr. JOHNSON. I know of a Nat Ganley.

Mr. TAVENNER. Possibly it is Nat Ganley.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, Mr. Counsel, it is; N-a-t.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were top leaders in the Communist Party and were they interested in the Ford section of the Communist Party. Did you confer with them or any of them at any time regarding the business of the union?

Mr. JOHNSON. I conferred once with—who was the first one you named?

Mr. TAVENNER. William Allan.

Mr. JOHNSON. No; you named 2 or 3.

Mr. TAVENNER. Carl Winter.

Mr. JOHNSON. Carl Winter. I conferred once with Carl Winter at my own request. We had a particular problem within the unit where we thought we could possibly get a better working relationship in the unit if people that we felt were associated with the Communist Party would cease certain disruptive activities within the unit. That was in the early part of 1946, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what was the nature of the disruptive work of the Communist Party within your unit?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, it was sniping generally at the elected chairman of the unit. I don't know where you—

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer with him at any later time than 1946?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, I never did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Dave Moore was active in Communist Party matters within your local?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, to the best of my knowledge Dave Moore is not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not speaking of whether he is a member now.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, as far as I know, he has never been—I mean, of my own knowledge. I haven't known Dave Moore too long, but I have never known of him—

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time, in behalf of your union, ask the Ford section of the Communist Party for any assistance in the matter of printing of leaflets or the distribution of leaflets relating to various issues?

Mr. JOHNSON. I can recall one time—now, I am not certain as to just what this setup was. I was told about it, and I availed myself of it. I remember in 1949, I believe, when I first ran for chairman of the foundry unit that some of our caucus members had arranged to have some mimeographing work done by—I think this was at the headquarters of the Progressive Party or some district headquarters or something, and we had some leaflets printed up there for the

purpose of—they were political campaign leaflets to be used in the election. If the Communist Party had anything to do with it, I didn't know anything about it. I think that was in—

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did they go to have that work performed?

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, we went to a place over on Michigan Avenue. There was a store front. I think it had the name of the Progressive Party right on the front of it, if I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you remember the address?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that 5642 Michigan Avenue?

Mr. JOHNSON. I believe that was—wait a minute, maybe I am mistaken. Maybe there were two places. I remember that one of the places had the name of the Progressive Party, I believe, on the glass or on a sign or something. There was a mimeograph machine there, and we had some political campaign leaflets run off there. Then we might have at another place at 5642, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. You think there were 2 different places?

Mr. JOHNSON. I am pretty sure of it, although I am not sure of the time, the exact time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you hold any of your caucus meetings—I might say of an inner group of your caucus—at 5642 Michigan Avenue?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, I never held any caucus meetings there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever go to 5642 Michigan Avenue on any type of business?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I think we did have the use of a mimeograph machine there. I think I went there to get some leaflets, to have some leaflets mimeographed.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you got the leaflets prepared at 5642, who composed the material—

Mr. JOHNSON. I always write my own—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). —that went in them? You wrote them yourself?

Mr. JOHNSON. I write my own leaflets.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer with others in the preparation of those leaflets?

Mr. JOHNSON. I don't believe so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive the assistance of any persons in the preparation of the leaflets, either by way of the material that went into them or the printing of them, by persons who were not members of your union?

Mr. JOHNSON. You mean did anyone operate the mimeograph machine?

Mr. TAVENNER. I mean arrange to have them operated or prepare the material who were not members of your union?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I prepared my own material. Just how the arrangement was worked out to get the use of the machine, I don't know. I was just informed that it was there if I wanted to avail myself of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what I am trying to find out, of course, is to what extent, if any, you either sought or accepted the assistance of the Communist Party in any of the affairs of your union?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, as far as I know, the Communist Party didn't have anything to do with it, as far as I know. I mean, I had a leaflet

that I wanted mimeographed for distribution at the gates as we usually do in our campaigns, and I understood there was a place where I could get the leaflet mimeographed, run off the machine, and it would cost me just a slight cost for the paper involved.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you raise your voice a little. It is difficult to hear up here. We have some competition, but we don't dare close the windows because it becomes too hot. Apparently somebody downstairs has decided to make it very hot for everybody up here.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I was stating I understood we could get mimeographed service there very cheaply if we would just pay the cost of the materials used, the ink and paper. Not having a lot of money of my own and needing the material for the campaign, I used that service.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that service performed by the Communist Party?

Mr. JOHNSON. Not to my knowledge, it wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then according to your testimony up to the present time, as far as I can understand it, you are stating that there was no cooperation of any kind in the operation of the affairs of your union as far as you are concerned with the Communist Party, is that the position I understand that you are taking?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, again that is an awfully general question. I have tried to respond to the questions that you have asked, but that question is of such a general nature. I wish you could again be more specific with the question. I am not trying to avoid answering. I fully want to answer every question that you ask me, but it is difficult to answer a very general question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, necessarily it must be general. What do you know about Communist Party activities within your union? You either know or you don't know.

Mr. JOHNSON. I assume that question would cover the whole period of time the union has been organized, is that it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you don't have to make it as all-embracive as that. Let us take from 1946.

Mr. JOHNSON. From 1946 what do I know of the—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, of the activities of the Communist Party within your union.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, as I stated to you before, I did have one meeting with Carl Winter in 1946, at which time—well, it wasn't just myself; it was myself and two others.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were they?

Mr. JOHNSON. We sought to—

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were they?

Mr. JOHNSON. It was the chairman of the unit and one other fellow.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were they?

Mr. JOHNSON. Horace Sheffield was the chairman of the unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the other person?

Mr. JOHNSON. Leroy Krawford was the other person. The three of us had a meeting with Carl Winter, and we thought that through such a meeting we could end the sniping, the internal dissension and the bickering that was going on with the unit that we thought was probably directed by people who were either close to the Communist Party or party members. We didn't know, but we had reason to suspect that, and we thought that if some of their pronouncements were correct in terms of trying to build the labor movement, they would

cease activities that were detrimental to the labor movement, or at least to that unit of the labor movement.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did all appearances of activity on the part of the Communist Party within your union cease after that conference?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, there was no change in the situation.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is going on today, isn't it?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; that is something I didn't say. I said it didn't cease at that time. That was 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then when did it cease?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I was speaking of an isolated instance that happened in a particular unit in 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that isolated incident cease?

Mr. JOHNSON. I say the situation that developed then didn't change any. It was the same way—I mean the chairman of the unit, Sheffield, myself, and this other person, were opposed to these people we thought were disruptive and being in an opposing political group we thought them politically—

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you observed any activity on the part of the Communist Party within your union since that time?

Mr. JOHNSON. You mean of the same general character?

Mr. TAVENNER. Of any character.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, you would have to define to me what these types of activities are. I may have one construction; you may have another.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, the facts are within your knowledge, whatever they are.

Mr. JOHNSON. But you are asking the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I can't anticipate what you may know about it.

Mr. JOHNSON. I can't anticipate what you are trying to arrive at. If I could, maybe I could be of some assistance.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you would just answer the question, that would solve the whole problem.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, if we are speaking of the labor movement as it is, I don't know of any—I can't put my finger on any such activity.

Mr. CLARDY. By that answer do you mean that you do not know of any Communist activity whatsoever within the union of which you are a member as of now?

Mr. JOHNSON. Not that I can put my finger on.

Mr. CLARDY. You are not aware of any such, then?

Mr. JOHNSON. Not that I could identify. I am not saying that there isn't, because there are 55,000 members in our local, but I mean I am speaking of what I can personally identify myself.

Mr. CLARDY. You are saying, then, that no evidence of any kind dealing with possible Communist activity in your union has come to your attention within recent months?

Mr. JOHNSON. Not that I can recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were James Jackson, Phillip Schatz, and Billy Allan, or any one of them, members of your union?

Mr. JOHNSON. Not to my knowledge they weren't.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been testified before the committee that each of these persons were members—in fact, leading figures—in the Communist Party in the city of Detroit, and that they did do work within your union, notwithstanding the fact they were not members of your union.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thought you asked me were they members of my union.

Mr. TAVENNER. I did.

Mr. JOHNSON. I said, "No"; not to my knowledge they weren't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did they perform any service of any character within your union?

Mr. JOHNSON. You mean of a paid service?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, no. I said of any character.

Did they confer with the membership? Were they parties directly or indirectly in any caucus?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, all that I know is that Billy Allan, being a newspaper reporter, would call the local for a story, just like any other newspaperman would. We have that happening all the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that the sole objective of Mr. Allan, to get a newspaper story?

Mr. JOHNSON. I don't know what his objective was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was that the sole activity in which he engaged as far as you know?

Mr. JOHNSON. I don't know what motivated him.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not speaking of his motive. I am speaking of his activity.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, as far as I would presume—I mean, if a newspaperman called me and asked me for a story on some incident, and I related of my own knowledge what the situation was, I would assume that he wanted that information for the press. What his motive would be, I wouldn't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course I am not speaking of the matter of obtaining news to print in his column of the Daily Worker. I am speaking of his activities in the Communist Party or his activities within your own union.

Mr. JOHNSON. He wasn't a member of our union. I don't know of any activities he had within our union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he meet with the officers of your union at any time?

Mr. JOHNSON. I can't recall of any time that he ever met with the officers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he meet with the inner caucus of your progressive caucus at any time?

Mr. JOHNSON. He might have. I don't recall, but the inner caucus—I don't know what the inner caucus is. What is the inner caucus?

Mr. TAVENNER. I thought you agreed that there was always within a caucus a smaller group within that number that met separately.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, if I was a Republican, for example, and I belonged to a particular congressional district—or a Democrat for that matter—I can assume that there will be members within all of those congressional districts or units, there may be a few people that may not agree with what the majority wants, and I presume they would meet, I don't know. That is just a general presumption based on a general question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Possibly this would clarify the question for you: The committee has sworn testimony that the inner caucus of the broad progressive movement at Ford's was controlled and dominated by Communist Party leadership. Upon a direction and final decision of full-time Communist Party organizers the candidates were selected for

various offices, not only with the various units of the Ford Rouge plant, but also on the local level. Now, does that clarify it any for you? Is that true within your own knowledge?

Mr. JOHNSON. Within my own knowledge, within my own caucus, I was the candidate for president. It was my caucus, and I don't know of anyone else that came within that caucus to run against me, because I made sure that the people that were in that caucus were supporting me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, but I was speaking of the progressive caucus of which you said you were the chairman. I am not speaking about your individual caucus.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, the caucus that I was chairman of was my individual caucus. There were several others there. They each were gathered around each one of the aspirants to the office. Each aspirant had his own group. I had mine. But there was no Communist Party leadership telling us who to select.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there a caucus within Ford which nominates officers for the national organization?

Mr. JOHNSON. National organization?

Mr. TAVENNER. From the local.

Mr. JOHNSON. You mean for the entire UAW?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. There is no caucus set up for that purpose, no. I mean, if we are going to support an individual for president of the UAW, it is just something that is discussed among all the leadership that are of a mind to support a candidate that may be opposed to the present president.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, is there a caucus for the selection of officers on a local level?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, we always have a caucus, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, did that caucus or any branch of it ever meet in the Communist Party headquarters?

Mr. JOHNSON. Not to my knowledge they didn't.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you know where the Communist Party headquarters are?

Mr. JOHNSON. Frankly no, I didn't.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you ever been there?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I knew—in 1946 it was my knowledge that the Communist Party headquarters was in the Lawyers' Building.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you ever been there?

Mr. JOHNSON. I went there, yes, at the time I indicated.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Tavenner, was that the headquarters you had in mind in your question, or were you thinking of another location?

Mr. TAVENNER. It is 5642 Michigan Avenue, the place I was referring to.

Mr. JOHNSON. I never knew that to be the headquarters. I always thought it was in the Lawyers' Building.

Mr. CLARDY. You are familiar with the location that counsel mentioned?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, I indicated that I had a leaflet run off there once.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes. Did you ever attend any meeting there?

Mr. JOHNSON. Not in 1946, no.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, at any time. My question isn't limited as to time.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was there to get the leaflet mimeographed.

Mr. CLARDY. No, I said attend any meeting. You went to get the leaflets, and of course I am assuming that that was not a meeting.

Mr. JOHNSON. No, it was not a meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think I can clarify one thing.

Mr. CLARDY. May I get one answer here, and then you may clarify. Did you ever attend any kind of a meeting at that location?

Mr. JOHNSON. I believe I did attend 1 or 2 meetings there prior to 1946.

Mr. CLARDY. I see. All right, counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. My questions were relating to the Communist Party headquarters of the Ford section. That was at 5642.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I understood that.

Mr. TAVENNER. But the one the witness referred to was the State headquarters of the Communist Party, which are two separate places.

Were you made aware of the Communist Party objectives in your union from any source since 1949?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, I can't say that I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be appropriate at this time to make public certain objectives of the Communist Party from the Communist Party's own mouth, so to speak.

Mr. CLARDY. Very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which may enable the witness to testify more definitely on that subject.

Mr. CLARDY. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. This is a rather extensive document, Mr. Chairman, which has come into the hands of the committee staff only recently and which is now being made public for the first time, and it points up at the hand of the Communist Party itself the main objectives of the Communist Party in your union, Mr. Johnson, as well as other automobile unions. I will not attempt to read all of this document because of its length and the shortness of time, but I will turn to page 2 and will read parts of it. This is a document which, from the content of it, shows that it emanated from State headquarters of the Communist Party, and from its content it shows that it was directed for the orientation of the work of all Communist Party clubs and commissions and groups in the State of Michigan, and I have asked the investigator to hand you and your counsel copies of it so that you may follow it as I go over it.

Mr. CLARDY. It may be called a party directive, may it not, counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir, and it analyzes the problems of the Communist Party and is a very enlightening document. I will begin reading in the break in the page near the bottom of page 2. First of all I will read the first paragraph as an introduction. The heading of this document is¹

RESOLUTION ON CONCENTRATION FOR DISCUSSION AT ALL CLUBS, SECTIONS,
COMMISSIONS, AND DEPARTMENTS

Our party in Michigan has a great responsibility to move the auto workers into struggle against their exploiters—the auto barons and their stooges in Government. The auto monopolists are a key section of American imperialism,

¹ This is printed in its entirety as Schemanske Exhibit No. 1, in pt. 2, p. 5116, of this series of hearings.

which seeks political and economic domination of the world, and the crushing of the people's democracies and the Soviet Union through a predatory war.

To make this more applicable to our problems in Detroit we come to the break in the page near the bottom of the page 2:

Our State committee has just reviewed 9 months of concentration work by our party, since the last State convention. In that time our party has increased its attention to the problems of the auto workers. The face of our party has been presented to the auto workers to a greater degree than in the past 10 years. We have seen the development of economic struggles, dramatized in the Ford strike against speedup, despite the stifling attempts of Reuther. A beginning has been made in the development of the united front from below.

This period of time has seen the consolidation of some party shop clubs, an improvement in the sale of party literature, a greater utilization of the Michigan Worker as the major instrument for the concentration work. Among our comrades in auto, there is higher morale, and greater confidence in the determination of the State leadership of the party to decisively influence the auto workers.

This resolution, based on the discussion of the State committee, and the experiences in the past 9 months, will attempt to present some of the major problems necessary to be overcome in charting the next steps.

The next has a heading at the top of page 3—

FOR A DRASTIC IMPROVEMENT IN THE WORK AMONG GENERAL MOTORS WORKERS

This is a precondition for further advancement in auto. GM employs 350,000 auto workers of the 1 million within the UAW. Saginaw Valley, comprising Flint, Pontiac, and Saginaw, is the heart of the GM empire, with 150,000 auto workers. The city of Flint has some 56,000 GM workers. Flint is the key to moving the GM division of the UAW, the division which Reuther heads, and therefore the key to striking a powerful blow against social democracy. Whatever develops in Flint has great influence on the entire UAW.

The UAW convention exposed the weakness of our party's industrial concentration method of work in auto. The anti-Reuther forces did not have a majority base in any one of the auto's big three. Where party work was on a relatively higher level as in Ford, the anti-Reuther strength was greatest. In GM, our main national concentration sector, the progressives were weakest of all. Flint and Pontiac, with strong anti-Reuther forces in the past, were Reuther strongholds in this convention despite the mass dissatisfaction of the GM workers with wage cuts, increased speedup, phony umpires, and frozen contracts. It's therefore clear that we need a drastic improvement in our work in auto, in the first place in our work in GM, without in any way curtailing our work in Ford which remains our main concentration point in Michigan's Wayne County.

In other words, Mr. Johnson, there is the statement of the party that as far as the party is concerned, Ford is the main concentration point.

Our leadership must face this problem and map out comprehensive proposals for continuous assistance and attention to this: The No. 1 Concentration on a State scale.

Now appears the heading which is emphasized in capital letters and underscored, which is as follows:

FOR AN IDEOLOGICAL CAMPAIGN ON THE ROLE OF THE WORKING CLASS AS THE PRE-REQUISITE FOR WINNING THE ENTIRE PARTY AND PROGRESSIVE MOVEMENT FOR CONCENTRATION WORK

Experience in the last 9 months has revealed that the mobilization of the entire party in Wayne County to carry through the concentration objectives around the Wayne County concentration on Ford, is totally inadequate. We have failed to carry through a consistent widespread ideological campaign within our party, as the basic prerequisite for concrete organizational steps to bring about a situation in which concentrated activity among auto workers, and particularly Ford, will be the basic method of work of the entire party. Such an ideological

campaign is necessary to take our concentration work out of the realm of another "task." Gus Hall, in his article in April's Political Affairs, expresses our tasks in this regard appropriately:

Mr. JOHNSON. You know who Gus Hall is, do you not, Mr. Johnson?

Mr. JOHNSON. I am not certain.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Gus Hall is one of the original defendants in the Smith Act cases.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thought so.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you—did you sign a petition in his defense at one time or a request of some character—

Mr. JOHNSON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. In his defense?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, I didn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. Before you read further, I think it ought to be pointed out on the record that what you have extracted from this rather lengthy document thus far, a document which originated with the Communists and may be said to be one chapter in the Communist "bible," has pretty definitely established one of the main points on which we were seeking evidence when we came to Michigan, and that was that the Communist Party has regarded the auto industry as one of the keys to its success in the United States and one of the keys in its efforts to paralyze this Nation in the event of conflict with Soviet Russia.

(At this point Mr. Johnson conferred with Mr. Franklin.)

Mr. CLARDY. As you correctly read, they decry the fact that there has not been enough effort to support Communist Russia, and there has been too much attack directed toward her, but in particular I am interested in the fact that it clearly now is an admission that in Detroit, Flint, and the other places in the State where the auto industry is large, the Communists are making their strongest efforts because of the reasons I have already recited.

I think any going forward—I don't know what you have in mind next, but I am particularly interested in a followup on that that will commence in the last paragraph at the bottom of page 3. Did you have anything intervening between where you read and that point?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Let us hear it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Referring to the article from Gus Hall, I read the following from this document:

As a result of our experience, it is now clear that industrial concentration cannot be viewed as a task; it is not an assignment that you give to one section of the party. Industrial concentration is a basic Leninist method of work for the whole party. Industrial concentration means giving life to some basic Leninist concepts of a Marxist Party. It gives life to the Leninist concept of the Communist Party as the vanguard of the working class. It gives meaning to the whole idea that ours is a working-class party. It gives life to the concept that we must take hold of the main link, the link that will move everything else at the given moment.

Mr. CLARDY. That, of course, is a short summary of what I was trying to say before. They regard obviously the industrial concentration, as they speak of the auto plants here, as the key to the whole movement and as the link, as they put it, that will move everything else at a given moment. In other words, a revolution will be launched with this as the base of operations.

Mr. MOULDER. May I now make a comment? This statement you are presenting here doesn't within itself constitute any proof of anything. Certainly it isn't any evidence against the witness now before the committee and certainly shouldn't reflect on him.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Moulder, may I suggest: This was presented as an exhibit by a witness who has testified about the general subject in one of the executive sessions we held last week, and it is linked up with pretty nearly every aspect of the party. At the moment, since that was in executive session, we are putting it in here in the open session, where it logically belongs as we are completing what we want to do here in Detroit. The links that tie it up with the other will be revealed, of course, when that additional testimony is authorized to be published.

Mr. SCHERER. I think what Mr. Moulder meant, that it shouldn't be tied in with this particular witness. I don't think that is the intent.

Mr. CLARDY. Oh, no. But it comes at a good time.

Mr. SCHERER. I agree with you there.

Mr. TAVENNER. The witness has stated that he did not know the objectives of the Communist Party within Ford, so I am producing those objectives now as stated by the Communist Party with the hope that he may recognize some of them after we have completed the document.

Mr. SCHERER. I think that is proper. I think what Mr. Moulder had in mind, that there shouldn't be any inference drawn at this point, at least, that the witness had anything to do with this document or the promulgation of the theories contained in the document.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. I think counsel's purpose of introducing the document at this time is proper in order to question the witness, but I certainly don't feel that we would want to leave the impression that this particular witness has had any part in the promulgation of the policies and theories contained in the document.

Mr. CLARDY. As I understand it, counsel, you intend when this is completed, to ask witness whether or not he has seen evidence of the carrying out of the directive from which you are reading.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is exactly it, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will skip the rest of the statement by Gus Hall and begin on page 4.

Mr. CLARDY. Before you do that, I wish you would do as I suggested and commence at the bottom of page 3 because there is a summation there that I think is extremely important that begins,

The working class will not play this decisive role automatically. It must be organized,

and so on.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

It must be organized, it must be made conscious of being a class in struggle with the capitalist class, it must be infused with political consciousness, it must be taught how to unravel the hidden forms of slavery and exploitation, it must be guided along the road to victory over its class foe. Marxism-Leninism is the key to accomplishing all these tasks. We must use this key by concentrated attention to this all-important and decisive section of the population.

Mr. CLARDY. Now I want you to read the next paragraph there because it, in my opinion, is as short a summary as I have seen as

to the coldblooded determination of the Communist Party to take over through that method. Now, will you read that.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

Industrial concentration is the basic method and approach toward everything we do. Issues and tactics will change, but the role of the working class in general and of the workers in basic industry in particular is a constant, permanent element in all industrial concentration plans or objectives. Industrial concentration is the method of work of the party of a "new type."

Finally, industrial concentration is not a seasonal occupation. It is not a method of work that we will use only for a period of time. It is a permanent method of work.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, Mr. Counsel, I think I should comment at this time that this, I believe, is the first time this committee has been able to place its hands on a Communist document in which they have admitted, as they do here, the prime importance to them of taking over, in this area particularly, because they regard it as the key to everything. I think this document has more significance than almost anything else the committee has uncovered in all its years of operation.

Mr. SCHERER. It explains some of this colonization we were talking about this morning.

Mr. CLARDY. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. Sending Communists from other parts of the country to infiltrate the local auto unions.

Mr. CLARDY. I want to bear down heavily in this record on the fact of the last sentence you read, that it is a permanent method of work, to do just exactly what they are suggesting in this document. In other words, it is not a part-time job; it is not one that will cease when our committee or other committees are on the job exposing, and then resume the moment that our back is turned. It will be carried on continuously without break or interruption, and therefore—

Mr. TAVENNER. It will be noted, Mr. Chairman, that the word "permanent" is underscored for emphasis.

Mr. CLARDY. That is right, and also in the preceding paragraph they speak of the word "method" as having importance because they underscore that when they are talking about the fact that issues and tactics may change, but this method that they are talking about is the key to everything.

Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

It is necessary to restate once again why Ford is the major concentration of Wayne County. Local 600 is the largest industrial unit in the world. The entire labor movement watches local 600 as a barometer indicating trends in the course and policies of American labor. Local 600 has been and still remains the biggest bulwark against the domination of the labor movement by the social democratic leadership and policies of the UAW.

That is an argument, is it not, Mr. Johnson, against the national organization with which your local is affiliated? Do you not interpret it so?

Mr. JOHNSON. It would appear that they are opposed to the—

Mr. CLARDY. It would definitely appear that the Communist Party didn't like, at the time they issued this, the leadership and didn't like the methods and didn't like what was going on at all.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

Local 600 has the largest concentration of Negro workers in America, the foundry alone employing some 6,000 Negro workers. The plant is located in the 16th Congressional District, the largest working-class district in the United States, populated by many national groups. This district alone has three heavily populated Negro communities, Inkster, Ecorse, and River Rouge. The Rouge, with its 60,000 industrial workers, the heavy concentrated population of foreign born, and the strong progressive Negro communities, all combine to make Ford the greatest potential force for peace, democracy, and socialism in Wayne County.

Mr. CLARDY. What they are really meaning there is that this is their greatest opportunity, the greatest opportunity for the Communist Party. They always manage to identify themselves with peace and with democracy.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

Such an understanding flowing from the ideological campaign would help to reorient every aspect of party work and party organization toward the central objectives of reaching, influencing, and winning the workers in auto. It would insure that auto would become the knowledge, concern, and everyday activity of all leaders and organizations of our party on all levels. It would assist all clubs of the party to undertake specific responsibility with regard to the main concentration of Wayne County, Ford, and to the miscellaneous auto section. Clubs would strive to recruit shopworkers, with the aim of changing the composition of many community and nationality clubs to embrace a majority of autoworkers and their families.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, now, that, as I interpret it, is a plain, unvarnished statement of their intentions to infiltrate every community group that they can and to take it over through familiar Communist tactics so that they would expand their control far beyond any union, but into every activity that comes along.

Mr. TAVENNER. I might remind you, Mr. Chairman, that the testimony of Mr. Mikkelsen bore very strongly on this point. He stated the purpose of the organization of the downriver group of the Communist Party and the 4 or 5 groups in that section was to aid the Ford section of the Communist Party.

Mr. CLARDY. That is right. Bearing in mind the fact that there are some people who think that the Communist Party has completed its work or has at least laid off for the time being, I hope those folks will note the fact that the Communists themselves say it is a permanent method of work, and they have admitted in this document that they intend to follow precisely the lines that this committee has been trying to get across since the first day it was organized. The danger is present and imminent. It is with us today, and I hope no one will miss that fact. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, we have taken evidence in many parts of the country, endeavoring to establish what the Communist Party plan was with regard to colonization which we heard something about here this morning. We have shown some instances of it in Boston and other places.

Mr. CLARDY. But that was through verbal testimony without any documents to back up.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, and in the face of constant denials from Communist Party sources that there was ever any such plan.

Mr. CLARDY. All right. With that in mind, read the next paragraph.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

Many comrades would be encouraged to volunteer to change their jobs to seek employment in large auto plants. Hundreds of additional comrades would be reenrolled in an ever growing brigade to go out early in the morning, in the afternoon and late evenings, to sell the Michigan Worker, party literature, or distribute leaflets at shops and in communities where autoworkers work and live. To organize and influence the wives and children of autoworkers through activities in the communities. In short, the activities of every club, section, department, commission, progressive mass organization would be directed toward helping in every way to achieve our objectives of auto concentration. No club or group of our party can grow and develop if its plans, perspective and activity are not constantly related to reaching, influencing and recruiting autoworkers.

The next heading is capitalized and underscored :

FOR A STRUGGLE AGAINST STRONG TENDENCIES OF ECONOMISM WHICH ENDANGERS
OUR WORK IN THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

and at this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to that part of the testimony of Dr. Dodd, Dr. Bella Dodd, that I read in evidence when the first witness took the stand during these hearings. Dr. Dodd commented upon the attitude of the Communist Party toward unions. Dr. Dodd said that their objective was not merely to consider the economic problems of the worker, but it was more a question of political effect. This is the language she used :

They—

meaning the Communist Party—

regarded with contempt unions engaged in what is called economism ; that is, improving the economic conditions. It is only important if it can be politicalized.

Now that was Dr. Dodd's testimony before our committee and which we have quoted on other occasions.

Now, this is what the Communist Party itself says about that subject, which demonstrates where their real interest lies :

The key link to accomplishing our objectives in auto concentration, is a forthright recognition of the need to struggle against and overcome strong tendencies of economism which have weakened our activity. This is a deep-rooted problem of long duration which has plagued us for many years. The recent period has not been distinguished by a vigilant struggle against it.

Mr. CLARDY. Now I want you to bear down heavily on the next one.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

Too much of our party work and activity is confined to narrow trade-union issues.

Mr. Johnson, have you observed in connection with your union any effort to minimize economism as is spoken of here and exaggerate the question of political activities of your union ?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, this is the first time I have come in contact with the term "economism." I thought at first it related to economy or conservation of funds or assets or something of that type, but in the context that it is used here I don't believe I have noticed any attempts on that level. All of our political activity is directed by our PAC which is national within the autoworkers' union, and whatever our political action decisions are made by our legislative bodies within the union, we follow those decisions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, if you have never been aware before this moment of what the objectives of the Communist Party are in your union, aren't you rather alarmed ?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, it doesn't alarm me too much as far as my union is concerned. I think perhaps this is a statement of—you say this is a Communist Party document. It appears to me it would be a statement of the Communist Party as they view the labor movement and my section of the labor movement. It certainly isn't mine. I would have to be in their position to appreciate what they are trying to put across here. I don't follow all of this.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't follow what the Communist Party is endeavoring to do to your union through that expression, which is this: That too much of the Communist Party's work has been confined to the narrow trade-union issues and not enough to strengthening the political struggle?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I don't know what that means.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us read on and see if it enlightens us:

It reveals itself most sharply in the neglect and underestimation of the party organization, unstable status of the shop clubs of our party, and the alarmingly low rate of recruitment of autoworkers into the party. Further evidence is our failure to fully utilize the major instruments of the party for mass education, and our acceptance of low standards of performance as our accepted norm. Our work is characterized by a continuous hesitation to undertake energetic action to move the workers into struggle on any questions outside of the immediate "practical" trade-union issues, particularly the struggle for Negro rights. Defense of the 12, activity in opposition to the North Atlantic Pact, and so forth. The sporadic activity to help build the Progressive Party, the poor attendance of autoworkers at the Marxist Michigan School of Social Science, all flow from economist tendencies which pervades our organization. One has but to analyze the subjects of discussion at the club meetings in the past months to realize that political education, which would lead to action on the major political questions of the day, are not always the predominant feature of our meetings. All this requires an intense ideological campaign against economism through systematic study and discussion of Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?*

(At this point Mr. Johnson conferred with Mr. Franklin.)

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

Unless the state board and state committee helps raise the political content and activity of our comrades in the shops, then the ability to lead workers effectively in resistance to the coming economic crisis will be most difficult. The root source of basic economic problems autoworkers face (speedup, short work-week, unemployment, impending wage cuts, attacks against Negro autoworkers, discrimination, etc.) is directly the result of the imperialist war program of the Wall Street monopolists and their efforts to create a Fascist United States. The auto barons and their lackeys in the labor movement are trying to put over a guns, not butter, economy. This understanding is the touchstone of everything.

The role assigned to the ACTU, Trotskyites, and especially the Social Democrats, is precisely to mislead and dull the fighting resistance of the workers. The betrayal by Reuther of the recent Ford strike against speedup was the logical consequence of his unqualified support for the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan, and now the North Atlantic Military Alliance, stepping stones toward fascism and imperialist war. To justify such betrayals he has often unashamedly admitted that these "sacrifices" were necessary in order that the war program be put over.

Communist auto workers understand this. Therefore they make a key contribution to the welfare of their fellow workers when they constantly strive to help raise the level of political consciousness and understanding. Only in so doing are the guarantees created to successfully resist the attempts of the monopolists and their lackeys to place the burden of the coming economic crisis on the backs of the workers.

In this period of mounting, crucial struggles, continuing economist trends and tendencies serve only to impair the class consciousness and understanding of workers. It becomes an impediment to the full mobilization of auto workers in the struggle against hunger, war, and fascism.

The struggle against economist trends has to turn from words and talk to deeds and action. The same organizing genious and zeal for detail, the same

alertness which Communist auto workers have learned in helping to organize, build, and defend their local unions, must now be reflected in organizing the fight for peace; organizing the fight for Negro rights; organizing the defense of democratic rights; organizing to bring the case of the 12 before their fellow workers and local unions.

In the coming months there will take place the full unfolding of the struggle of the auto workers to break through the deadlocked 1949 economic and bargaining demands and make the auto barons pay for the unfolding economic crisis.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

To help guarantee this fight and break the deadlock, our party projects the following main campaigns for the next 3½ months ; the fight for peace, defense of the 12, fight against white chauvinism and for Negro rights, full participation in municipal elections. To the extent that these questions become the concern of the auto workers and they move on them, to that extent will be their victory on the economic questions.

Mr. Chairman, that explains why so much of this evidence has indicated activities along those lines.

Mr. CLARDY. I think that is enough out of that particular document. There are some other things I am interested in, but I believe that adequately sets forth the major part of what I had in mind and what you had in mind.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I will make just brief reference, if it please the chairman, to the second document which relates to this same general matter. This seems to be a document of implementation in which the directives from the article that we did refer to are the directives to be put in force. I will not take time to read it, but just merely point out that it follows the same general line, but describes in detail how the objectives that were mentioned are to be accomplished.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, it goes into detail even to telling how much literature shall be distributed and what kind and what meetings shall be held and what topics shall be discussed and what activities shall be engaged in generally, doesn't it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir, and it concludes :

Organization of a Ford Workers Committee for Release of the 12.

This committee to sponsor radio time, leaflets, letters to Ford Facts, telegram campaign.

Building delegations to be sent to New York to see Medina.

Speakers before building meetings.

Mass meeting to be organized in Dearborn.

Gigantic banquet in honor of Bill McKie.

And then in the same detail the plan is set forth as to what is to be done for the struggle for Negro rights which the Communist Party is endeavoring to assert as an issue for its own political purposes. There are nine different categories under that document.

Now, Mr. Johnson, having read that document—

Mr. JOHNSON. Which one?

Mr. TAVENNER. The first document—somewhat in detail, I would like to ask you what you have observed in your own union to indicate that the Communist Party has set about the accomplishment of the things mentioned in this document.

(At this point Mr. Johnson conferred with Mr. Franklin.)

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, this is the first time I have seen this. Of course I haven't had a chance to read it with the same degree of con-

centration that you have, so I am still not altogether familiar with what they are talking about or driving at in this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you like to answer at some future date?

Mr. JOHNSON. You mean after reading this?

Mr. TAVENNER. After reading it and studying it, to what extent in your judgment the Communist Party has succeeded or failed in accomplishing the objects which it has set forth.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. JOHNSON. I think I can draw the general conclusion from what I have heard you read that they have evidently failed. It seems—one section here seems to indicate that they have evidently failed—let us see if I can find the section.

Mr. TAVENNER. The document, as you will notice on the last page, was prepared in November 1949, August 8, I think, 1949.

Mr. CLARDY. Am I to understand, Witness—and I do so understand from what you say—that this is the first time you have seen a copy of the document in question?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, it is.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I think that we will call a recess for 5 minutes at this time, and maybe you can inspect it a little bit during that time.

(Whereupon, at 2:55 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 3 p. m.)

(Whereupon, at 3:10 p. m., the hearing was reconvened.)

Mr. CLARDY. The hearing will resume.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think I should offer the two documents in evidence marking the first one presented as "Johnson Exhibit No. 1" and the second as "Johnson Exhibit No. 2."

Mr. CLARDY. They will be received.

(The documents, "Resolution on Concentration for Discussion at all Clubs, Sections, Commissions and Departments" and "Plan of Work Dearborn Auto Section From July 15 to November 1, 1949," marked "Johnson Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2" respectively were received in evidence.)¹

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to raise a question as to why these are marked Johnson exhibits. I don't know anything about these exhibits. They don't mention me.

Mr. CLARDY. That is a technicality, sir, to indicate the point in the record as to which matters are introduced. It has no other significance than that.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would generally assume that when an exhibit is marked in a manner like that, it would pertain directly to me. I think it should be marked committee exhibit. It is not my exhibit.

Mr. CLARDY. I gave you the explanation. There is nothing unusual about that. We have put them by the hundreds in that same fashion without any particular reference to anybody or anything.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. JOHNSON. I would just like the record to show that it doesn't refer to me. I don't know anything about them.

Mr. MOULDER. I think the witness is correct in his contention on that point.

¹ See Schemanske Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2, pt. 2 of this title, pp. 5116 and 5122.

Mr. JOHNSON. Sure, I don't know anything about this.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call your attention to the second document, Mr. Johnson, on page 2 of section 4, entitled "Role of Communists in the Progressive Coalition." There you will see in the first sentence it is stated—

Individual Communists are expected to show the greatest personal responsibility in helping to build and strengthen the Progressive coalition on a local wide scale as well as in the buildings. The coalition must develop beyond a temporary electoral combination into a permanent and stable organization, functioning on an all-year round basis, reacting to issues, putting out material, holding meetings, organizing activity on the issues facing the Ford workers.

Can you enlighten us in any way on the role of the Communist Party and the progressive coalition as you saw it?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, with respect to what is printed here in this document, the only enlightenment I could throw on that is that the caucuses are generally not held until just before election time.

Mr. TAVENNER. You started to state to the committee what was said in the document, as I understood you. I think you had some comment to make about what is said there.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, with respect to what is contained here, the only thing I could add by way of clarification is that as far as my own caucus was concerned, we never met except at around election times, and then only to get together funds and plan the election campaign. I don't know what they are alluding to here. Evidently that is something entirely different from what we did. Within the local union I don't recall any caucuses being held except at around election time, and that is customary in all unions, I suppose.

I want the committee to be aware of one fact. I didn't—what is written here I only accept at face value. I don't know what the thinking, the motivation, the purpose of it is. All I can express is what I have done myself as an individual, and within my own caucus we met at election times to try to pick a slate of officers that were acceptable to the majority within the group and then go out and get them elected, and that happens in every political group. Otherwise they wouldn't get elected.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you any information that you can now give the committee, after having read some of the principal parts of these two documents, regarding the Communist Party purposes in connection with Ford in general as to the extent of success or failure of the Communist Party and the attainment of its objectives?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I looked over this document during the recess, and the impression that I gained from looking at it is that they state that their objections—on page 2—

There are eight objectives listed there, and as they would relate to my union, one of them says, "to stimulate the broadest united front actions of employed and unemployed." Well, at that time I don't recall there being any unemployed in our plant, so I really don't see what they are driving at as far as our plant is concerned. If I recall correctly, in 1949 we were at a pretty high peak of employment. We had no unemployment that I can recall.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, of course, I presume that you have undoubtedly noted that facts never hamper the Communists when they are putting out their literature, and the fact that there may have been a peak of

employment at that time would not stop them at all in reciting to the contrary. I am sure you must have discovered that that is a common Communist practice, have you not?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I can assume that from looking at this, because it wasn't the case in my local union. We didn't have any substantial unemployment that I can—

Mr. CLARDY. My question was, haven't you noted that that is a common tactic, practice, on the part of the Communists to never allow themselves to be hampered by the truth and by the facts?

Mr. JOHNSON. I can assume that is true.

On the second point there under those objectives, it seems to me that is something you would have to understand Marxism, I guess, to understand what they are driving at, and I certainly don't understand it, so I won't even attempt to interpret it. On the third one—

Mr. SCHERER. You say you are a graduate lawyer of Wayne University?

Mr. JOHNSON. I said I was a graduate law student. I am a graduate of the law school. I didn't say I was a lawyer.

Mr. SCHERER. Graduate of the law school.

Mr. CLARDY. As I understand, you did not take the bar, so you are not a practicing attorney?

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. JOHNSON. No, I am not an attorney at all. I make a distinction between a law student and an attorney.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, if you completed your law education, you at least did not take the further step of taking the bar examination and being admitted to practice?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is correct, not as yet.

Mr. CLARDY. I thought I so understood when I said that.

Mr. JOHNSON. On the third point, to heighten the unity between the Negro and white workers, as long as I can recall, there has always been a great degree of unity between Negro and white in the local union. We have never had any major or racial problem within the local union since the union has been organized in Ford.

Mr. CLARDY. That phrase, "white chauvinism" then had no application certainly so far as you observed it in your local?

Mr. JOHNSON. I really don't know what they are driving at as white chauvinism.

Mr. CLARDY. It is rather obscure, but it is a mouth-filling word that they use continually to foment trouble between your race and mine, sir, and I am sure that from what you are saying you observed no such thing in your local.

Mr. JOHNSON. No, there has never been any—the only time there was any racial problem at all in the local was prior to the formation of the local during the strike in 1941. There was a substantial number of Negro workers and other workers, perhaps 20,000 of them, that remained within the plant during the strike in 1941, and a substantial number of those were in the foundry unit, because a percentage of them mistrusted the union at first because of the discrimination that was practiced in unions generally prior to the inception of the union at Ford. Other than that I don't recall of any period at all where there was any racial tension within the local union, not even during

the race riots in Detroit, and of course I wasn't here. I was in the service at the time, but I have been told that there was no untoward accident at all—or incident at all—within the confines of the Rouge plant. Now, the fourth point here, I don't know of any—it says to lead widespread rank-and-file movements in the plant. Well, we have always congratulated ourselves on the fact that we think we have perhaps the most wideawake group of rank-and-file members in our union and in any comparable union anywhere in the world, for that matter, so the fact that Ford workers are intelligent doesn't surprise me. I have known that all along.

Number 5, I don't quite follow what they are driving at in number 5, to help build, broaden, and unify a coalition of progressive forces.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course those are, as stated in the heading, objectives stated broadly. They are general objectives of the Communist Party.

Mr. JOHNSON. There is another section here that I noted, the next paragraph states,

We have seen the development of economic struggles dramatized in the Ford strike against speedup despite the stifling attempts of Reuther.

Well, the international union gave the local union complete support in that strike. We won the strike against the Ford Motor Co. and as a result of that we got some contract changes in 1949 that obviates that problem to some extent. I don't see the connection between this statement and the strike.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I think we are just wasting time.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have any more subjects to cover, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. I might ask the witness one question further about the document.

Mr. SCHERER. Quibbling now, Mr. Tavenner, the witness is; it is obvious.

Mr. TAVENNER. The document recognizes a plan to encourage volunteers to change their jobs to seek employment in large auto plants. Were you familiar with any plan of that character, or did it come to your attention?

Mr. JOHNSON. I am sorry. I was concentrating on the remark of the gentleman to the left of the chairman. He stated I was quibbling. I wish he would clarify that, please.

Mr. SCHERER. I mean just what I say.

Mr. JOHNSON. Quibbling. I am afraid if I answered, it would be claimed that I was quibbling. I don't know how to answer the question, to be honest with you.

Mr. CLARDY. Is there a question pending, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I asked the witness if there came to his attention at any time a matter referred to in this directive where persons were directed to change their jobs, to seek employment in large auto plants. Was that situation drawn to your attention at any time?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, it wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been referred to often as colonization of industry by the Communist Party.

During the course of the hearings in 1952 a question was asked Harold Franklin who was a witness as to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party, and he refused to answer it. Do you

know of any reason why he should have refused to answer that question?

Mr. JOHNSON. As to whether or not I was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. I guess it was just his general objection to answering at all, I guess.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, had you been a member of the Communist Party at any time?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, I was; in 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1942?

Mr. JOHNSON. 1943, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I would like to state this, that in 1942, in November of 1942 I was fired by the Ford Motor Co. for allegedly refusing to instruct a group of workers to return to work who had walked off their jobs. Actually I had simply told the fellows that they had to make the decision themselves; I wasn't going to tell them to leave the job, and I wasn't going to tell them to stay on the job. I thought they had a just grievance; we had a grievance in the file, but I was fired because they claimed I refused to undertake an obligation to make the men go back to work. I was fired for about 2 months. That was in November, I believe, of 1942, and I was reinstated in January, I believe, of 1943, and at that time I was pretty sore at the Ford Motor Co., I guess, because I felt I had been unfairly discharged; I hadn't done anything that I thought was a justification for the discharge, and in resentment I did pay 50 cents for a membership in the Communist Party. A month later I was inducted in the service of the United States Army and was there for 2 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you reaffiliate with the Communist Party on your return from the Army?

Mr. JOHNSON. In 1945 I was approached by an individual who told me of the formation of the Communist Political Association, and I understood that it was a political party that had changed its old stand—that had changed its previous stand and position and was co-operating with the Government of the United States, was not a party of communism as it had been in the past, and based on that assumption I joined it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What year was that?

Mr. JOHNSON. 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I remained a member of—well, let me try to explain it. I have seen in these proceedings from the 1952 hearing that the Communist Political Association was supposed to be disbanded in May of 1945. But it was in May of 1945 that I joined it, and actually the only thing that I can recall is that we would have a meeting once in a while. The meeting was open to anybody that cared to come into the meeting, and I think it lasted for about 4 or 5 months, if my recollection services me correct, and just sort of—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I am informed that in some areas in the country the local groups of the Communist Political Association waited a little while before taking action upon developments generally in the

country, and there could have been a period of a few months before it was converted to the Communist Party again.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, that kind of confused me because I can't recall exactly the dates, but I am certain that it wasn't in May of 1945, because I didn't get out of the Army until May of 1945, and it was then that I joined the Communist Political Association.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, how long were you affiliated with the Communist Party or the Communist Political Association?

Mr. JOHNSON. I can't state for—

Mr. TAVENNER. From the time of your rejoining in 1945?

Mr. JOHNSON. Until, I would say, the late spring of 1946. You will recall in my earlier testimony I stated that we had a meeting with Carl Winter at which time we sought to end some disruption that was taking place within the unit. As a result of that meeting I could see then that nothing was going to be done toward eliminating the disruption and the confusion that was created within the unit, and I just decided, well, then, as far as I was concerned, I didn't want anything else to do with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what did you do about it?

Mr. JOHNSON. I just quit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Notwithstanding you quit the party from the standpoint of being a member, a dues-paying member of it, did you continue to collaborate with the members of the party in its work in connection with your union?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, I did not. I wasn't in any meetings with anyone from that group. I wasn't aware of what their purposes or their objectives were, and I just was not in contact with them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is your union taking any action of any character to discourage or to prevent Communist infiltration into your union?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir, we are. Since 1948 the membership of local 600, in a referendum vote, directed that the local union officers sign the Taft-Hartley affidavits as a prerequisite to holding office within our local union, and that has been the rule within our local union since 1948. No member may be a local union officer unless he has first signed the non-Communist affidavit under the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, of course that is only a part of it. The Communist Party, by the methods that have been demonstrated time and again before this committee has ways and means of influencing the action of the Communist Party without necessarily being members of the official family. Have you taken any precautions of any character to prevent their getting control of, for instance, the progressive caucus?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, in 1950, in the summer of 1950, the local union's general council—that is the highest legislative body within the local union—directed that all officers, committeemen—that is, the unit officers, committeemen, as well as general council delegates, anyone holding an elective or appointive office within the local union, is to sign a loyalty affidavit. That was in the summer of 1950. I am trying to tell you the actions of our broad general membership as taking steps in the direction to prevent anybody who is a member of the Communist Party from coming into the leadership of the local union or any of its units, and these are actions that were taken by the highest legislative body within the union, within our local union.

Mr. TAVENNER. I take it then from what you say that you would be opposed to the Communist Party concentrating its efforts upon—making its main concentration point in Wayne County upon the work in Ford?

Mr. JOHNSON. I certainly would be.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand by that that you would oppose it?

Mr. JOHNSON. I certainly would.

Mr. TAVENNER. In every way that you could?

Mr. JOHNSON. I certainly would.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand from that that you consider that it is a dangerous influence upon the legitimate work of the trade unions?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you not alarmed with the statements contained in this document, it was not so much the issues of the union they were interested in as it was matters of political moment?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you answer?

Mr. JOHNSON. I said that was true. I agreed with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you gentlemen, either of you, have any questions?

Mr. MOULDER. No.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes. Mr. Chairman, while I think this witness, if he wanted to, could give us a great deal more information than he has, I think he is to be complimented for answering most of the questions fairly and fully and not using the fifth amendment to avoid answering the pertinent questions, at least.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have any questions, Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No.

Mr. CLARDY. The witness will be excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. George Leroy Ellery.

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Chairman, may we go off the record before the oath is administered?

Mr. CLARDY. First we will swear the witness. The witness will hold up his right hand.

Mr. CROCKETT. He has certain objections—

Mr. CLARDY. The witness will please hold up his right hand at this time. After he is sworn I will permit the witness to address the Chair, but not before then.

Mr. ELLERY. I have here—

Mr. CLARDY. Hold up your hand, Witness, and be sworn. Now do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ELLERY. I do.

Mr. CLARDY. I see you are represented by counsel. Will you identify yourself on the record, sir?

Mr. CROCKETT. George W. Crockett, Jr., 3220 Cadillac Tower, Detroit.

Mr. CLARDY. Be seated. Now, Witness, if you have some question you wish to address to the committee that is pertinent to the hearing going forward, the Chair will entertain it—not a written statement, however.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE LEROY ELLERY, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS
COUNSEL, GEORGE W. CROCKETT, JR.

MR. ELLERY. Mr. Chairman—

MR. CLARDY. Do you have a question? If you are going to read that long prepared statement, I shall not permit it.

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

MR. ELLERY. I have a—

MR. CLARDY. Let me make myself clear, Witness. You have been here and have heard the Chair's ruling on these things. I cannot possibly, in your case, make an exception any more than I could for anyone else. If you have a brief question to address to the Chair about our procedure or anything else pertinent, all right, but I see you have a lengthy typewritten statement consisting of at least 2 pages, and maybe more, for all I can tell from here. I shall not permit that until and unless you have answered the questions propounded by the committee. If you do that, and if the statement is pertinent, at the conclusion it may be permitted. Otherwise it will not be entertained in any form at any time.

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

MR. CLARDY. I think, Mr. Tavenner, we might as well proceed with the first question.

TR. TAVENNER. Mr. Ellery, when and where were you born?

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

MR. ELLERY. I believe the chairman said if I had a question I could state it.

MR. CLARDY. I can't hear you.

MR. ELLERY. I believe the chairman said if I had a question I could state it.

MR. CLARDY. Well, I changed my instruction when you refused to say anything at all, and I have instructed him to proceed, and he will proceed.

MR. ELLERY. I have a motion to quash the subpena, and I would like to give my reasons for it.

MR. CLARDY. No; we will not entertain a verbal motion of that kind. If you have a written motion there, you may file it with the counsel, and it will be given due consideration.

MR. ELLERY. I only have one copy.

MR. CLARDY. Even though it is filed late—under the rules it should have been filed prior to today—but if you file it—

MR. ELLERY. I would like a ruling on my motion to quash the subpena, and I would like my right to read the written reasons.

MR. CLARDY. You submit it in writing to us, and we will entertain it at the proper time.

MR. TAVENNER. Is your name signed to it?

MR. ELLERY. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. All right; thank you, sir.

When and where were you born, Mr. Ellery?

MR. ELLERY. I was born in Detroit, Mich., on July 1, 1930.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in Detroit?

MR. ELLERY. I do.

MR. TAVENNER. Have you lived in Detroit during your entire life?

Mr. ELLERY. Yes. May I qualify that? I have made my residence in Detroit for my entire life. I have, of course, been outside the city occassionally.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you served in the Armed Forces?

Mr. ELLERY. I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that, in what period of time, approximately?

Mr. ELLERY. I believe it was September 1950 to May 1951.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you have been a member of the Labor Youth League in Detroit?

Mr. CLARDY. Before you answer that, I want to make a statement for the record. I have inspected the motion you filed—and I am interrupting prior to the asking of that rather pertinent question to let you know that on inspection I find that this is precisely the same in content, if not almost in language, as the several other motions that have been filed with us attacking the constitutionality of the act creating and authorizing this committee to operate and objecting to the procedure and other matters. The motion is denied.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please?

Mr. ELLERY. Will you restate it? I was interrupted.

Mr. TAVENNER. You would like for me to restate it?

Mr. ELLERY. Yes, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Labor Youth League in the city of Detroit?

Mr. ELLERY. I would like to say this, that in the reasons that I gave to quash the subpena, included among them was that I believe the committee is exceeding its constitutional powers and asking questions of political belief, and since—

Mr. CLARDY. Keep you voice a little higher, Witness. It is difficult to hear.

Mr. ELLERY. And since the previous testimony has indicated that the Labor Youth League is an organization which is of a political character, I must cite the reasons that I have given in my motion to quash the subpena, and further I urge my constitutional grounds under my privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ellery, we have just heard read in testimony here a document of the Communist Party outlining certain objectives that it had in connection with the automobile industry in this area. One of its projects or one of the things upon which it proposed to center its efforts after 1949 was increased training on the part of Communist Party members at the Michigan School of Social Science. Did you attend the Michigan School of Social Science in 1949?

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

Mr. TAVENNER. And, if you did, I would like you to tell the committee the circumstances under which you entered that school.

Mr. ELLERY. I understand that the school has been mentioned as a political-type school; is that correct?

Mr. TAVENNER. It was a school of the Communist Party.

Mr. ELLERY. Well, since that is a political question, I must refuse to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is informed that on January 28, 1950, a Communist Party mobilization was held at Yeamen's Hall in Detroit. Were you a representative to that meeting from the Dodge section of the Communist Party?

Mr. ELLERY. Again I may point out this is a political question, and therefore I must again state my reasons are the same as before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ELLERY. This is becoming a little repetitious. It is a political question. I will give the same reasons as I gave before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ELLERY. Well, the same reasons as I gave before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Same question, same answer?

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Any questions?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Any questions?

Mr. MOULDER. In what branch of the armed services did you serve?

Mr. ELLERY. I took basic training under the Corps of Combat Engineers.

Mr. MOULDER. That was in the Army?

Mr. ELLERY. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. You served in the Army during what period of time?

Mr. ELLERY. To the best of my recollection it was from September 1950 to May 1951, I believe I stated.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you serve out your full period of enlistment?

Mr. ELLERY. No, I did not.

Mr. MOULDER. For what reason were you discharged so early.

Mr. ELLERY. I was never given an official reason.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you receive an honorable discharge or dishonorable discharge?

Mr. ELLERY. I did not receive a dishonorable discharge. I received a general discharge under honorable conditions.

Mr. SCHERER. When was it that you picketed the Army recruiting station here in Detroit?

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

Mr. ELLERY. I assume you believe that this is a political picketing. I therefore refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. I don't know what kind of picketing it was, but on February 7, 1948, our information indicates that you picketed the Army recruiting station in Detroit.

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

Mr. SCHERER. Did you so picket on February 7, irrespective of your reason?

Mr. ELLERY. I will give the same reasons and the same answer as I did before.

Mr. SCHERER. Was that before or after your discharge?

Mr. ELLERY. Was what?

Mr. SCHERER. When you were picketing the—

Mr. ELLERY. Well, the same reason, the same answer. I don't answer the question on the grounds of the fifth amendment and all the others.

Mr. SCHERER. Why did you picket the Federal Building on April 28, 1950? What was the reason for that picketing?

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

Mr. ELLERY. May I ask if that was the period when the House Un-American Activities was here?

Mr. CLARDY. No; it was not. We will answer that.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you picket it when we were here the last time?

Mr. ELLERY. The same reason; the same answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you?

Mr. ELLERY. I said I will give the same reasons, the 1st and 5th amendment, as cited in the motion to quash the subpoena.

Mr. SCHERER. But you asked the question whether or not that was the time the committee was here on a previous occasion.

Mr. ELLERY. Well, I just didn't know the time.

Mr. SCHERER. Your last Communist Party card was issued in June 1948. That was the last time the party issued cards. Is it not a fact that the number of that card was 72419?

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

Mr. ELLERY. Mr. Congressman, that is what you are testifying to. As for myself, I give the same answer for the same reasons.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, you call it my testimony. Was my testimony false?

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

Mr. ELLERY. Well, I certainly hesitate to call a Congressman a liar, but I give the same reason and the same answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Don't hesitate at all. That has been done many times.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you answering the question?

Mr. ELLERY. I said I give the same reasons and the same answer as in my motion to quash the subpoena.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. I have one more question. Where are you now employed?

Mr. ELLERY. I am employed at the Dodge main plant of the Chrysler Corp.

Mr. MOULDER. Where do you reside in Detroit?

Mr. ELLERY. 7329 Prairie Avenue.

Mr. MOULDER. How long have you been employed at the Dodge plant?

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

Mr. ELLERY. I have been employed approximately 6 years, about 5½.

Mr. MOULDER. What are your duties now—

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

Mr. MOULDER. In your employment, in the performance of your work?

Mr. ELLERY. I am a truckdriver.

Mr. MOULDER. That is all.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, are you now or have you ever been a member of any organization whose avowed purpose is the overthrow of this Government through the use of force and violence?

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

Mr. ELLERY. I would like you to be a little more specific. I couldn't answer that question of a general character like that.

Mr. CLARDY. Which word in the question is not understood by you?

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

Mr. ELLERY. Well, I am answering in respect that it was a general question.

Mr. CLARDY. I have propounded the question, and I now direct you to answer the question.

(At this point Mr. Ellery conferred with Mr. Crockett.)

Mr. ELLERY. I refuse to answer for the same reasons.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness dismissed. Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Paul Ross Baker, will you come forward, please?

Mr. CLARDY. Hold up your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BAKER. I do.

Mr. CLARDY. Be seated, and since you are accompanied by counsel, will counsel identify himself for the record, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. SIMMONS. C. LeBron Simmons, 585 Gratiot Street, Detroit.

Mr. TAVENNER (addressing witness). What is your name, please?

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name, I mean.

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

TESTIMONY OF PAUL ROSS BAKER, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, C. LeBRON SIMMONS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TAVENNER. Speak a little louder, please.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if pictures could be—

Mr. CLARDY. I can't hear a word you say, for some reason or other.

Mr. TAVENNER. He is asking about photographs, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BAKER. During the time that I am in the witness chair, could the pictures be stopped?

Mr. CLARDY. Flashlights will be stopped, gentlemen, from here on out. Now proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. BAKER. Paul Ross Baker.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Baker?

Mr. BAKER. I was born in 1925 in Ypsilanti, Mich.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. BAKER. Willow Run Village, Mich.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Willow Run?

Mr. BAKER. I have lived in Willow Run since September 1951.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1951?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time where you did you reside?

Mr. BAKER. I would like to ask the committee of what relevancy this is to the purposes and activities of the committee.

Mr. CLARDY. I should tell you, witness, that neither counsel nor the committee ask questions that we do not deem relevant, and we deem that such, and to help you with your answer, prior to your coming here, I believe you were attending Michigan State College, were you not?

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. BAKER. I refuse—I would like to state that I would like to—

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. BAKER. Because the committee has indicated that they deem this relevant, I would like to refuse to answer the question or decline to answer on the basis of the fifth, first, and sixth amendments.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, I am sure that you did attend Michigan State College, and since I am a resident of East Lansing also, I am sure there can be nothing incriminating in your admitting that fact. I direct you to answer that question which was whether or not you were a student at Michigan State College prior to the time that you came to the Willow Run location in 1951.

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. BAKER. I would like to state that I would like to give the same answer as I gave before with the same reasons, and if I in the future decline to answer any questions, I would like to have it be known in the record that it will be for the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. You need only state at that time for the same reasons, but I must advise you at this time that an inquiry as to whether or not you attended a college, if answered honestly, either "yes" or "no", could not possibly incriminate you, and I do not think you are entitled to the protection of the fifth amendment. The advice upon which you have acted is not sound in the opinion of the Chair, but you are entitled to raise it if you wish at your own risk. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived at a residence known as Trailer K-30—

Mr. BAKER. I decline—

Mr. TAVENNER. Out at Michigan State College?

Mr. BAKER. I decline to answer on the same grounds as previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your employment at Willow Run since September 1951?

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. BAKER. I decline to answer on the same grounds as previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, I do direct you to answer that last question.

Mr. BAKER. I decline to answer upon the same grounds, the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present position?

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, I think that the committee should take a few moments to suggest that you should reconsider the answer to those questions on which I have directed you to answer. We have no desire whatever to see anybody ensnare himself by following advice that is not good or sound, as you obviously are in this instance. The questions upon which you were directed to answer could not, in the judgment of the committee, furnish a foundation for a proper invocation of the fifth amendment. We have no desire whatever to do anything that will harm you. If anything comes of this, it will be entirely due to your own action, and I beg of you at this time to reconsider and to permit us to restate those questions and give you an opportunity to clear the record. Now, won't you do that?

Mr. BAKER. I must decline for the same reasons. I thank you for giving me your advice, as you put it, but upon the knowledge that I have of the committee and its activities and functions, and with the

apprehensions I have for its overstepping its bounds according to my constitutional rights, I must decline.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are you now employed?

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. BAKER. I must refuse to answer upon the same grounds as previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. I direct you answer that question. Unless you are actually engaged in some criminal conspiracy, unless you are engaged in something that is of criminal nature, merely stating the nature of your employment cannot possibly incriminate you. It is a misuse of the fifth amendment, and I direct that you answer that question.

Mr. BAKER. I would like to ask the Chair of what—

Mr. CLARDY. Just answer the question. I will not answer any more questions. I have done my best to help you and to prevent you from making a mistake. Now, from here on out you are on your own, and I am directing you to answer that question.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, in directing me to answer it, are you saying that this question is material or relevant to the—

Mr. CLARDY. Definitely, very definitely.

Mr. BAKER. Well, therefore, I must decline to answer upon grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, it should be obvious to you and to your counsel that you are clearly in contempt of Congress.

Mr. BAKER. That is the inference that you make, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, the courts have so held on that, and where there is doubt we never make that statement. In this instance you are badly advised, and I suggest you take your time in answering the rest of them from here on out.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the United States Marine Corps between 1943 and 1946?

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. BAKER. Yes; I was a member of the Marine Corps in those years.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you returned in 1946, where did you make your residence; at what place did you make your residence?

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. BAKER. I decline to answer, based upon the same grounds as previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. I think you should direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; I so direct.

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. CLARDY. Let him reply, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, is this question also relevant to your—

Mr. CLARDY. I told you earlier, Witness, that the committee is not given to asking questions unless they deem them relevant and pertinent to the subject of the inquiry. The answer to your question is "Yes." Now will you proceed to answer it or decline as you may desire.

Mr. BAKER. Therefore I must decline, upon the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. After your service in the Armed Forces of the United States, did you attend an educational institution at the expense of the United States Government under the GI bill of rights?

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. BAKER. I decline to answer that question upon the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. I direct that you answer. That invocation of the fifth amendment on such a question is a direct affront to the dignity of the Congress of the United States, to assert that an act passed by Congress bestowing benefits upon worthy veterans who have fought in support of the things this Nation stands for is obviously so far from my protection by the fifth amendment that it ought to be clear even to you, and that is why I direct you to reply.

Mr. BAKER. I am very much aware of my esteem for the Congress of the United States, but I still decline to answer your question and this committee's question of that nature on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. How could it possibly incriminate you to tell this committee whether or not you received the benefit of Government funds under the GI bill of rights?

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. CLARDY. We are not asking you as to whether you used those funds for some improper purpose; not at all.

Mr. BAKER. I do not have to answer any question regarding the reasons besides the stated reason for my declining to answer.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, that may be your judgment on it, but you are sadly in error, sir. I am indeed sorry to see you follow this course.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been acquainted at any time with a person by the name of Bolza Baxter?

Mr. BAKER. I must decline to answer upon the same grounds as previously stated.

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BAKER. I decline to answer upon the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time that you received benefits under the GI bill of rights.

Mr. BAKER. I decline to answer upon the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BAKER. I decline to answer upon the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you ever been a member of an organization whose avowed purpose is to destroy this Nation through the use of force and violence?

(At this point Mr. Baker conferred with Mr. Simmons.)

Mr. BAKER. I decline to answer upon the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness dismissed. Call the next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Evelyn Gladstone.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you hold up your right hand? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I do.

Mr. CLARDY. I see you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. STARR. I. R. Starr, 2017 Dime Building, Detroit, Mich.

Mr. CLARDY. I should state for the record—

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mr. CLARDY. If you will both give me your attention for a moment, I should state for the record that the document which is not labeled

at the top, but which I construe to be a motion for dismissal of the subpenna, has been handed to the committee, and the motion is denied. The motion will be placed in the file.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mr. STARR. Would you hold it a minute, please?

TESTIMONY OF EVELYN GLADSTONE, ACCCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, I. R. STARR

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Mr. Chairman, I believe there are other motions on that same sheet of paper which I would like the Chair to consider before I begin my testimony.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I can tell you that we considered that as one entire document. You raised several points or objections. If you want to speak of them as several different motions, all right, but the entire document and whatever it contains is denied. Any request for relief thereon is denied, would be a better way to state it.

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I am ready for the question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Mrs. Evelyn Gladstone.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am sorry; will you speak a little louder?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Mrs. Evelyn Gladstone.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your maiden name?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Evelyn Gesoff; G-e-s-o-f-f.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. At 30530 Pierce Road in Garden City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Michigan?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Michigan.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of what place are you a native; that is, where were you born?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you move to Michigan?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. In 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. From Philadelphia.

Mrs. GLADSTONE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what place did you move in Michigan when you came from Philadelphia in 1944?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. May I confer with my counsel, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Certainly.

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I should clarify that in 1944 I did not make Michigan my legal residence. I merely came here as a student, and my legal residence remained Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. CLARDY. You came as a student to the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, did you not, at that time?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you make Michigan your place of residence; that is, your domicile, legal domicile?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Upon my—let me see—when I became of voting age.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you become a resident of Michigan, what place?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. In Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived there continuously until the time you moved to Garden City?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you at the present time an officer of an organization entitled the Better Schools Committee of Garden City?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I will decline to answer that question on the basis of the first amendment which guarantees me the privacy of certain associations that I may or may not form and on the basis of the fifth amendment which, as you well know the text of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. How could it be that membership in a Better Schools Committee could possibly incriminate you?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Well—

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Mr. Counsel, since I do not have the benefit of knowing what your next six questions may be or what line of questioning my answer may open to you, I invoke the same privileges that I invoked before.

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I will have to ask that the witness be directed to answer the question.

Mr. CLARDY. I so direct.

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I will decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated with the understanding that the protection given me and other citizens of our country is not limited to self-incrimination or any other meaning that this counsel chooses to give it.

Mr. CLARDY. Isn't the Better Schools Committee a public organization in that community?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Mr. Chairman, that may or may not be so, but in declining to answer this question, I do so without aspersions cast upon any organization, but merely to protect my rights since I fear that in answering any questions before this committee I may waive certain of my constitutional privileges which are given me in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, I must say the Chair is moved to say that today I have seen the worst type of legal advice given to witnesses appearing before us that I have ever heard before in all the time I have been on the committee. Now, I want to ask you this: You are in fact an officer of that organization, aren't you?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Are you asking me a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CLARDY. I am.

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I must decline to answer the question for the same grounds as previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. I direct that you answer.

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. If you will represent to me that my answering of that question will not constitute a waiver of any of my privileges, I will answer it.

Mr. CLARDY. It is not the custom of this committee or any other committee of Congress to enter into bargains or deals.

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I am not asking for a bargain or deal.

Mr. CLARDY. I will bring this to a head: When you were at the school from which I also graduated, the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, were you not a member of the Ralph Neafus section of the Communist Party?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. We dropped the other question then.

Mr. CLARDY. You refused to answer it. I am moving on to this.

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I see. I refuse to answer that question also, Mr. Chairman, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you not in 1948 transfer from that student section of the Communist Party to the organization at Ann Arbor called the Town Club—and not to be confused with the Town Club of Lansing to which I belong?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I don't want to confuse the proceedings here any more than you do, Mr. Chairman. I will decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I invoke my same privileges as previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you now or have you ever been a member of any organization whose avowed purpose is the destruction of this Government through the use of force and violence?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I decline to answer that question also on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Tavenner, unless you have some very important questions, I think I will dismiss this witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask one question?

Mr. CLARDY. You may ask as many as you want, but I tell you how I feel about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now hold a certificate to teach at Garden City?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I have no contract with any board of education at this time. I am a full-time employee as a wife and a mother at this time.

Mr. CLARDY. You were asked whether you held a certificate, not whether you were employed and using it. You didn't answer the question.

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Will you restate the question? I misunderstood. You said provision to teach in Garden City. That would imply a contract.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now hold a certificate to teach in Garden City?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. The teaching certificates are not given in localities. They come through the State, Mr. Counsel.

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have a teacher's certificate at the present time?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. To the best of my knowledge my provisional certificate has expired. It expired in 1952, which I might explain, the reason for that being that I received a secondary certificate, and in order to get a permanent certificate, you must teach for 3 consecutive years in your field, and I changed fields before the 5-year period expired, and therefore that was the reason that it expired, that the certificate expired.

Mr. CLARDY. Your answer is, you do not hold a permanent certificate.

Mrs. GLADSTONE. No, I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you renewed your certificate since that time or at any time?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Is your question, have I applied for a renewal of the certificate?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, you may answer it that way. That was not my exact question, but you may answer that first. Have you applied to renew your certificate?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. No, I have not applied to renew my certificate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has it been renewed?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. No, it has not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you teach in 1952?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Is that question relevant to these proceedings, Mr. Counsel

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Well, then, I will decline to answer that question for the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Just one question, witness: How long were you a reporter for the Daily Worker?

(At this point Mrs. Gladstone conferred with Mr. Starr.)

Mrs. GLADSTONE. Is that a question?

Mr. SCHERER. Oh, yes. How long?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. It seems a little presumptive, but I will decline to answer that question for the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you deny that you were a reporter for the Daily Worker?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I decline to answer for the same reasons, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you ever have a byline in that paper?

Mrs. GLADSTONE. I decline to answer for the grounds previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Moulder, any questions?

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Any further questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness excused, and due to the lateness of the hour, I have an announcement to make, and will the room please remain quiet until I have finished it.

The committee members find it necessary to take an early plane for Washington because a matter of intense interest to the State comes up on the vote tomorrow, and that is the St. Lawrence seaway

project. Accordingly there will be no session of the committee tomorrow, Thursday.

There will be a session in this same place on Friday. So all of the witnesses who have been subpenaed to appear up to and including today and subpenaed for appearance tomorrow or Friday or any other day of the week and have not been called will appear at 9:30 a. m. on Friday morning next.

The hearing is adjourned until Friday morning at 9:30 a. m.

(Whereupon, at 4:23 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 9:30 a. m., Friday, May 7, 1954.)

INDEX TO PART 4

INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Allan, William (Billy)-----	5260, 5263, 5264
Appell, Donald T-----	5228, 5231
Baker, Paul Ross-----	5286-5290 (testimony)
Baldwin, Bereniece-----	5224
Baxter, Bolza, Jr-----	5226, 5227-5248 (testimony), 5289
Bellinson, Bernard-----	5248, 5249-5255 (testimony)
Cichocki, James E-----	5221, 5222-5227 (testimony)
Crockett, George W., Jr-----	5281, 5282-5286
Dennis, Tom-----	5248
Dodd, Bella-----	5272
Ellery, George Leroy-----	5281, 5282-5286 (testimony)
Franklin, Godfrey-----	5255-5281
Franklin, Harold-----	5278
Ganley, Nat-----	5260
Gesoff, Evelyn (Evelyn Gladstone)-----	5290
Gladstone, Evelyn (Evelyn Gesoff)-----	5289, 5290-5294 (testimony)
Gore, Jack-----	5240, 5243-5245
Hall, Gus-----	5268, 5269
Henry, Milton R-----	5227-5248
Jackson, James-----	5259, 5260, 5263
Johnson, William H-----	5255-5281 (testimony)
Krawford, Leroy-----	5262
McKie, Bill-----	5274
Medina-----	5274
Mikkelsen, Harold M-----	5271
Moore, Dave-----	5260
Nelson, Walter M-----	5221, 5222-5227
Reuther, Walter-----	5267, 5273
Schatz, Phil-----	5259, 5263
Schnaar, Mitchell-----	5248, 5249-5255
Sheffield, Horace-----	5262, 5263
Simmons, C. LeBron-----	5286-5290
Starr, I. R-----	5289, 5290-5294
Truman, Harry S-----	5225
White, Jack (radio newscaster)-----	5243
White, John (Jack)-----	5243
Winter, Carl-----	5260, 5262, 5280

ORGANIZATIONS

Better Schools Committee of Garden City, Mich-----	5291
Briggs Manufacturing Co-----	5224, 5251, 5252
Chrysler Corp-----	5226
Chrysler Corp., Dodge plant-----	5285
Communist Party, Michigan :	
Ann Arbor Town Club-----	5292
Dodge section-----	5283
Ford section-----	5260
Ralph Neafus section-----	5292
Communist Political Association-----	5279, 5280
Communist Youth Club-----	5240

	Page
Congress of Industrial Organizations	5222
	5224, 5226, 5254, 5256, 5265, 5267, 5270, 5272
Dodge plant, Chrysler Corp.	5285
Ford Motor Co.	5251,
	5253-5255, 5259, 5267, 5269-5271, 5274, 5277, 5278-5289
Ford Motor Co., Rouge plant	5251, 5259, 5265, 5278
General Motors	5267
Independent Progressive Party	5260, 5261
Jewish Community Center	5252, 5254
Ku Klux Klan	5245
Labor Youth League	5229, 5231-5233, 5237, 5238, 5240-5248, 5283
Labor Youth League, Detroit	5283
Labor Youth League, Flint	5243-5246
Labor Youth League, Michigan	5229, 5231, 5238, 5243
Michigan School of Social Science	5273, 5283
Michigan State College	5286, 5287
New York University	5253
North Atlantic Military Alliance	5273
North Atlantic Pact	5273
Political Action Committee, CIO	5272
Progressive Party. (See Independent Progressive Party.)	
United Auto Workers, CIO	5222, 5224, 5226, 5254, 5256, 5265, 5267, 5270
United Auto Workers, Briggs Manufacturing Co. Local, CIO	5224
United Auto Workers, Local 600, CIO	5254, 5256, 5270
United Auto Workers, Local 742, CIO	5222, 5226
United States Marine Corps	5288
University of Michigan	5235, 5290, 5292
Wayne University	5277
Wayne University Law School	5256
Young Communist League	5224
Young Communist League, Foster-Mooney branch	5224
Young Progressives	5240-5243
Young Progressives, Flint, Mich	5240

PUBLICATIONS

Daily Worker	5225, 5226, 5264, 5293
Detroit News	5225
Ford Facts	5274
Michigan Worker	5272



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 3319

